

THE
METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1855.

ART. I.—TAYLOR'S WESLEY AND METHODISM.

Wesley and Methodism. By ISAAC TAYLOR. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.
12mo., pp. 328.

WITH respect to most questions which have divided the opinions of men, contemporary judgments may be safely referred to the calm investigation and the abiding verdict of posterity; but along the line of the world's history there stand out certain prominent events on which the repose of impartial opinion never settles. Excited passion is a whirlwind that extinguishes the taper of reason—a rushing flood that renders turbid the pure stream of the judgment, so that truth cannot be clearly discerned. The intense passions, evoked by the collision of great principles, possess an enduring vitality, not only giving tone and complexion for life to the opinions of those who first roused them into existence, but surviving to influence future partisans and distant generations.

Whether Cæsar was justified in crossing the Rubicon, and Brutus in wielding the fatal dagger in the Roman senate-house, are still open questions; and whether “the man, Charles Stuart,” was righteously deposed and brought to the block, or Cromwell was a disinterested patriot or a gross and consummate hypocrite, has not yet been settled by the unanimous voice of posterity. Though the taste of the age in which we live has, in some measure, corrected the bitterness and scurrility which once characterized the partisans of opposing systems, yet of the great religious as well as political controversies of the past it may be affirmed, that the grave softens no animosities and time heals no wounds.

More than a century has elapsed since the Wesleys began their career as evangelists, and yet malignity and misrepresentation are as busy with their names as when Bishop Lavington's book appeared,

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. VII.—21

and Toplady dipped his pen in what Southey calls the essential acid of Calvinism, to express the intense bitterness of his heart against John Wesley and infant Methodism. It is true, that the enemies of Wesley and his doctrines, in these days, sometimes speak of him in measured terms of eulogy, but they usually qualify their praise by depreciating some particular attribute of his character; thus proving how much easier it is to be apparently generous than to be strictly just.

This undeviating and long-continued course of misrepresentation can no longer be attributed to personal feeling, for those who were Wesley's contemporaries during his career of signal ministerial success, have for half a century slept with him in the grave, and are now represented by their grand-children. Nor can it be ascribed to ignorance, for Wesley's Sermons and Journals have been published broadcast, and the most particular information touching his life and labours has long been within the reach of every hand. As we would not charge the authors of the many works on Wesley and his labours, who have failed rightly to appreciate his character, with wilful misrepresentation, we adopt the construction of charity, and account for their enmity by identifying them with certain theological opinions, which, descending unchanged from one generation to another, are unconsciously associated with feelings of partiality toward those who may have defended them, and of enmity toward those who have earnestly assailed them or exposed their unsoundness.

The book before us is not in spirit an exception to the class to which allusion has been made. Though more insidious in its character, it is yet as replete with bitter and relentless hostility to Wesley and his associates as any of the works which have preceded it. It is due to the author to state, that he designed his book to have special reference to Methodism in England; but as Methodism, in its essentials, is one, throughout the world, we shall take leave to examine it in its larger application to the labours of Wesley, and to their legitimate results in the most comprehensive sense.

The work was apparently suggested by the agitations prevalent some years ago among English Wesleyans; and the author seems to have cherished the insane hope of severing the bond which unites the societies, and of building up the "Establishment" from the fragments of dismembered Wesleyanism. It bears evidence of haste and carelessness in its preparation, though the author assumes the grave character of historian, philosopher, and prophet, as well as of theologian. As a literary performance it scarcely rises to mediocrity; its history is utterly unreliable—its philosophy is affected and obscure—its theology is crude, undigested, and self-contradictory—

and its prophecy consists of the wild imaginings of one whose judgment of the future is born of his wishes.

It may be admitted, that the story, in its leading outlines, is sufficiently accurate; that John and Charles Wesley were born in the early part of the eighteenth century—that they were educated at Oxford, and became presbyters of the Church of England—that they were leaders in an extraordinary religious revival—that, as the work enlarged, the assistance of lay preachers was called in—that, by their joint exertions under the blessing of God, large masses of people were united in societies—that these people were called Methodists—that this revival graciously affected all religious denominations then known in England—that the Wesleys continued to be its leading spirits while they lived—and that they finally died, leaving their cares and responsibilities as a legacy to their sons in the gospel;—but in all the explanations, philosophical discussions, and amplifications of every sort, with which the writer fills in the picture he has given us, we frankly disavow any faith or confidence whatever, unless they happen to be known to us through earlier and better authority than his own, or are corroborated by some authentic testimony. On almost every page, under an ill-disguised affectation of candour, his secret enmity may be discerned, while it is somewhat wonderful how seldom, even by accident, he shows the slightest perception of the high, the good, or the true.

In his initial chapter the writer affirms, without a shadow of evidence, that the Methodism of the present time has ceased to be that proclaimed by Wesley and his coadjutors, having lost certain essential elements, and having been so modified that the relation sustained by the preachers of the present day to the fathers and founders of the communion, appears “to be made up more of what is technical or conventional than of what is substantial, in a purely religious sense.”

“The Methodism of the eighteenth century has, we say, ceased to have any extant representative among us. None are there now who, with an entire congeniality of feeling, can interpret to us its phrases, or can warmly and forcibly speak of it, and plead for it, as a reality with which they are themselves conversant.”—P. 17.

On this naked assumption the author takes his stand, and proceeds to take the dimensions of the Methodistic movement, as a thing by-gone, and with the air of a connoisseur examining an antique, he gauges the mental and moral power of its leaders, analyzes the substance of the body itself, discusses its form, and foreshadows its future.

To conciliate the unsuspecting reader, and obtain for himself the vantage ground of apparent candour, he thinks proper to put for-

ward the admission, that Methodism must be religiously regarded as a genuine development of the principal elements of Christianity, "while yet it may be open to exceptions, on many grounds, as the product of minds more good and fervent than always well ordered." This qualification gives line and scope for innuendo, disparagement, and misrepresentation, which are so liberally employed as not only to neutralize the effect of the admission, but invariably to place Methodism and its founders in an odious and objectionable light.

With respect to the gratuitous assumption that the Methodism of the eighteenth century has at present no "extant representative," we take leave to record our opinion in direct opposition to that of our author. What was the Methodism of the eighteenth century but the doctrines and worship proclaimed and practised by the Wesleys and their followers? And can any intelligent mind really doubt that these identical doctrines and forms of worship are preached and practised at the present day, not only in England, but in other parts of Europe, as well as in America, Asia, and Africa? The river whose broad surface and profound depths can float the navies of the world, and from whose angry surges when swept by storms, the boldest mariner shrinks back in alarm, may be traced in its backward course to the tiny streamlet issuing from some far-distant hill-side, and from whose ripple no living thing turns aside; yet it is the same stream. The man of far-reaching intellect, and physical maturity, cannot doubt his identity with the child of other years. The Theban Hercules who destroyed the Lernean hydra, was the "extant representative" of him who strangled the serpents in his cradle. So the broad stream of Methodism, which is to-day fertilizing the world, and making fruitful its waste places, may be traced directly to the diamond fountain which first gushed up amid the arid sands of Oxford.

It is not, however, necessary that we should attempt to establish the negative of this proposition, as the author himself ignores it toward the end of his book, having convinced himself, we may suppose, that the facts developed by more diligent examination fail to support his hasty postulate. In proof of this, we quote the following enunciation of his more mature opinion, namely, "If the Wesleyanism of this present time be not the Methodism of the last century—a fact concerning which we profess to advance no opinion, as we have no sufficient information," &c.—P. 211.

In his chapter on "the Founders of Methodism," speaking of the worthies of that period collectively, the author says:—

"Let it be confessed that this company does not include one mind of that amplitude and grandeur the contemplation of which, as a natural object—a

sample of humanity—excites a pleasurable awe, and swells the bosom with a vague ambition, or with a noble emulation." Not one of the founders of Methodism can claim to stand on any such high level; nor was one of them gifted with the philosophic faculty—the abstractive and analytic power. More than one was a shrewd and exact logician, but none a master of the higher reason. Not one was erudite in more than an ordinary degree—not one was an accomplished scholar, . . . not one was a great writer, . . . As to administrative tact and skill in government, the world has given them (or their chief) more praise than they or he deserved, while baffled in its own perplexed endeavour to solve the problem of Methodism, in ignorance of the main cause of its spread and permanence."—P. 25.

Whether the founders of Methodism were, without exception, men of the loftiest intellect, and "gifted with the philosophic faculty," is an abstract question which at present we are not required to discuss, inasmuch as we are far more deeply interested in their labours, and their practical results. If Methodism be of God, and can vindicate its title to be regarded as a divinely-accompanied agency for the salvation of men, by many infallible proofs, no denial of "scholarship" or "administrative tact and skill in government, or philosophical cast of mind," in Mr. Wesley, can detract anything from its claims to our confidence, respect, and affection. When the Jews were hard pressed by the inferences resulting from the miracle of healing, wrought by the Saviour upon him who had been born blind, instead of venturing to express a doubt of the reality of the miracle itself, they began to discuss the question of Christ's personal holiness. Our author cannot be permitted thus to divert attention from the main question at issue. Still it may not be amiss to place on record an admission or two, which he inadvertently makes in subsequent parts of his book.

One finds himself embarrassed to know what really are the author's opinions, when, after seeing a little, presuming a great deal, and jumping to conclusions, he invalidates his own affirmations by contradictory statements. What weight should be given to the testimony of a witness, who, affirming that Mr. Wesley possessed no great amount of "administrative tact and skill in government," and that neither he nor any one of his associates "was erudite in more than an ordinary degree, and not one an accomplished scholar," should, before his testimony was completed, be compelled to admit that Mr. Wesley "has never been surpassed by any general, statesman, or Churchman, in administrative skill, and that he and his companions were scholars and gentlemen?"—Pp. 41, 79.

A similar course may be pursued to refute another baseless assumption of the author, which seems designed to disparage the work achieved by the Wesleys, by suggesting that the confessedly

deplorable religious condition of England in the early part of the last century has been greatly exaggerated.

"The rectory at Epworth might be brought forward as an instance in abatement of much that has lately been said of the 'state of religion and the Church' in the early part of the last century; just as Luther's home contradicts the exaggerations in which some Reformation champions have indulged themselves. That rectory was not a solitary instance; it was a *sample*, if not of many, of more than a few, clerical homes; and besides, it furnished indirect evidence concerning another main element of the religious condition of England at that time, and which is too little regarded. The characteristics and the excellences of the antecedent and contemporary nonconformity were there extant—in an occult manner, perhaps, and yet really. Some of the very choicest samples of the firm, consistent English Christian character have been the product of the nonconforming or puritanical soul blended with the *better-ordered and more broadly-based Christian temperament of the Episcopal Church*."—Pp. 26, 27.

This extract is evidently designed to serve the double purpose of undervaluing the great Wesleyan awakening, and of suggesting an oblique eulogy upon the Episcopal Church. In both its aspects, we make no appeal to the unmistakable voice of history, but permit the author to refute his own assumption, which he does in the following emphatic language:—

"The Church at that time, although it had *animus*, had no soul, and no concentration, moral or spiritual. It had slid far away from the Reformation ground. In reply to its assailants—the Methodists—it dared not make its appeal, as they did, to the Articles and Homilies, nor did it retain more than a very feeble devotional sympathy with the liturgy. Scarcely at all, in a religious sense, or otherwise than from motives of interest, was the aristocracy of that age attached to the Established Church: the mass of the upper classes was utterly indifferent, or was avowedly infidel; As to the masses of the people, they were nearly lost to the Church, except when a parson or a magistrate could gather them as a mob to carry some purpose of violence. Wesleyanism came in with its itinerant ministry, its local preachers, its classes, its bands, its trusteeships, and its fiscal organization; it came in, not to supplant any existing system of actual discipline, or of Church training, but to establish a culture of some sort, upon the waste, howling wilderness of popular irreligion. When it effected conversions, then it also provided for and carried forward the cure of souls. The cure of souls—a very few exceptive cases allowed for—had been wholly neglected or forgotten on all hands, at the time of the Methodistic revival. . . . The people of England had lapsed into heathenism, or a state scarcely to be distinguished from it."—Pp. 56, 122, 217.

The Epworth ghost of course reappears in this work—"old Jeffrey" being reinvoked to furnish the author with an occasion to philosophize upon the occult relations of spirit to matter, and to account for what he calls the "instinct of belief" in Mr. Wesley's mind. He states that Mr. Wesley regarded the disturbances which occurred at the Epworth parsonage as "divine interpositions" or "miracles," and expresses the opinion that nothing could occur "so marvellous

that it could not freely pass where Jeffrey had passed before it." The author's discussion of this topic leads him to the conclusion that around us, not cognizable to our senses, there are beings not more intelligent than apes or pigs, some of whom by chances or mischances may in long cycles of time be thrown over their boundary, and get an hour's leave to disport themselves among things palpable. We have not the cruelty to molest him in the exercise of the "philosophic faculty" with which he is evidently "gifted;" but we think it time this ghost were laid. The repetition of a falsehood told by another is bad enough; but language wants terms to stamp with adequate detestation the professed historian who will calumniate the virtuous dead by deliberately coining a falsehood of his own to bolster up a favourite theory or promote partisan purposes.

The statement, that Mr. Wesley believed the unexplained disturbances which occurred at his father's house, to be "divine interpositions" or "miracles," or in any way supernatural, may be pronounced a sheer fabrication, which, though repeatedly asserted, is entirely unsupported by evidence. The affair took place when he was only thirteen years of age, and absent from home at school; and his knowledge of the circumstances was mainly obtained four years afterward from the different members of his father's family. His own account of the affair, published in the *Arminian Magazine*, begins thus:—

"When I was very young I heard several letters read, wrote to my elder brother by my father, giving an account of strange disturbances which were in his house at Epworth, in Lincolnshire. When I went down thither, in 1720, I carefully inquired into the particulars. I spoke to each of the persons who were then in the house, and took down what each could testify of his or her own knowledge. The sum of which was this:—On December 2d, 1716, while Robert Brown, my father's servant, was sitting with one of the maids, a little before ten at night, in the dining-room which opened into the garden, they both heard one knocking at the door," &c. He continues, and gives a clear and particular narrative of all the circumstances connected with this remarkable affair; but neither in this nor any other of his writings can be found any expressed or implied belief in its supernatural character.

On a point of so much importance, we might reasonably expect to find some evidence adduced in confirmation of the author's naked *ipse dixit*; but the reader will search for this in vain. Though he were one "whose word but yesterday would have stood against the world," we deliberately impeach the veracity of his statement, and demand such confirmation as will satisfy an impartial umpire.

It is somewhat amusing to observe with what pertinacity, and yet with what strange recklessness, the author applies his pruning-knife to the intellectual reputation of Mr. Wesley—lopping off one attribute after another until he leaves him “a good man,” it is true, sincere and honest, but destitute of any one preëminent mental trait. Even his reputation as a logician, in the author’s opinion, is undeserved. He may have been, he says, “a master of *technical* logic, but he scarcely seems to have been capable of that equipoise of the mind” which is required to deal successfully with the principles of the science. He was sufficiently well fitted to preside in the moderator’s chair, during the disputations at Lincoln College, where an acquaintance with the hackneyed sophisms of the schools was alone necessary; but “there was no philosophy abroad in the world—there was no *thinking* that was not atheistical in its tone and tendency; and the whole energy of his moral nature would have drawn him off from any commerce with it, even if the structure of his mind had allowed him to tread at all on that path.”

Our object in making this extract is not to enter upon any refutation of the charge,—this were surely a work of supererogation,—but to point out a kind of anachronism which is quite unpardonable in a writer who presumes to arraign before him “such men as those who originated Methodism, and then, with an assumption of philosophic ease and a feeling of irresponsibility, deals with his worthies and sets upon them their price and value. We allude to the statement that, during Wesley’s residence at college, “there was no philosophy abroad in the world—there was no *thinking* that was not atheistical in its tone and tendency.” The reader, who is familiar with the history of ethical philosophy, will doubtless remember that, at the period referred to, the Christian world was in arms in opposition to the theory of Hobbes; and that Cumberland, Cudworth, and Clarke, all men of profound erudition, with others, had appeared as the champions of Christianity in opposition to the atheistical doctrines of the former; and that the conflict at the very period referred to, was at its height, enlisting the minds and pens of such men as Butler,* Hutcheson, and Berkeley, in England, and Jonathan Edwards, in America. Surely the author could scarcely have been more unfortunate in the selection of a period in European history, of which he might affirm that no philosophy was then abroad, or that there was no *thinking* that was not atheistical. There were, in truth, giants in philosophy in those days, who, roused from a lazy acquiescence in the earlier ethical hypothesis, by the monstrous con-

* Of Bishop Butler, Horace Walpole remarks, “he was wafted to the see of Durham on a cloud of metaphysics.”

sequences which Hobbes had legitimately deduced from it, stirred up their strength to measure the hitherto unfathomed depths of that science, and they have proved to us, enlightened as we are by what followed, that they were skilful in sounding, and that their lead touched the bottom.*

The foregone determination of the author to "make a case" against Mr. Wesley, leads him to distort the most unimportant actions of his life, and that which in another would have passed unobserved or been considered entirely indifferent, in him is made the theme of grave philosophic discussion, and forced to do service in accounting for what, in the author's judgment, are objectionable features in the Wesleyan doctrines and economy. These discussions would be less censurable did they not abound with so many half-disguised sarcasms and sneering epithets—with so much calculated to ridicule vital piety itself, as well as disparage Wesley and Methodism.

With regard to Mr. Wesley's early religious course, our author divides it into "two stages." "The *first* was that which brought him over from the unbroken hilarity of his natural temper to a fixed seriousness and a determination to frame his course of life under the sovereign control of religious reasons and motives." The "*second* stage" he does not explain, but states that he did not pass through it until he had come under "a spiritual influence of a deeper sort, namely, that of his brother Charles and his praying companions. Charles Wesley's soul had in it more of altitude (profundity and elevation) than John's," &c. Whatever may have been the nature of this "second stage," or "transmutation," as he elsewhere calls it, it must have reached regeneration, for he expressly rejects Wesley's opinion of himself as not a regenerate man at this period. One cannot but admire the modest assurance of the man, who thus on a question of this character, with which Mr. Wesley could alone be acquainted, presumes thus flatly to contradict his recorded testimony. His object is not, however, to elevate the standard of piety, or to show that Mr. Wesley undervalued his own religious attainments, for his motives are resolved into selfishness or a species of religious egotism, which Mr. Taylor considers quite consistent with much self-denial for the good of others. Yet, though he was a regenerate man, he had but an "imperfect apprehension of Christianity!" He fortifies this opinion by a reference to Wesley's "opposition to his father's proposal, that he should take steps for being appointed as his successor at Epworth."

"His earnest piety at this time showed itself in an immovable resolution to think only of his own (supposed) spiritual welfare; and in defending himself

* Vide Sir James Mackintosh.

in this position, he stretched sophistry to the utmost—evading by shallow pleas, at once, the import of his ordination vow, a clear call to extensive usefulness, and (if such considerations might be listened to) the duty of a son toward his parents.”—P. 37.

Our author is not alone in censuring Mr. Wesley for opposing his father's wishes by refusing to take any measures to secure the next presentation to the living of Epworth. Dr. Southey and some others have criticised his conduct in this matter with much severity; but if his reasons for this decision are calmly considered, it will be admitted by every impartial person, that his motives were conscientious and pure. The main arguments of Mr. Wesley to justify his course were two: *first*, at Oxford he was placed in circumstances more conducive to his own spiritual improvement; and *secondly*, he thought he should be far more useful there. It cannot be denied that the first great duty of the individual is the salvation of his own soul; and if there be a situation or an employment, the duties of which make this difficult or impossible, it is equally clear that it should be avoided or abandoned. It is readily admitted that his religious judgment was as yet immature and perplexed. Having no clear and well-defined view of the doctrine of salvation by faith, he was inclined somewhat, we think, to the notions and practices of the Ascetics, believing in the efficacy of retirement from the world and of self-denial to promote growth in grace and perfect the Christian character. These notions he had learned from Jeremy Taylor's Rules of Holy Living and Dying.

“I know,” says he, writing from Oxford on this subject, “if I could stand my ground here and approve myself a faithful minister of our blessed Jesus, by honour and dishonour, through evil report and good report, then there would not be a place under heaven like this for improvement in every good work.” The facilities he there enjoyed for retirement and study, and the associations he had formed, made him unwilling, with the views he then entertained, to abandon Oxford and enter upon the charge of a large parish. Admitting the correctness of his premises, who can deny the soundness of the conclusion?

But his leading reason, drawn from his conviction of greater usefulness at Oxford, is evidently well founded, if a jealous regard for the purity and holiness of the Christian ministry is conceded to be a sufficient motive for determining his decision. “The schools of the prophets,” says he, “are there; is it not a more extensive benefit to sweeten the fountain than to purify a particular stream?” The Apostle Paul on a memorable occasion would not be persuaded to abandon the path of duty, by the arguments or the tears of his

friends; and his refusal resulted in the establishment of the Christian religion in the capital of the world, while it furnished him an occasion for writing several epistles, which enrich the sacred canon, and have imparted instruction and consolation to unnumbered millions, and will go down to the latest times to preach Christ and turn many to righteousness. Some critic of that period may have called Paul "unfeeling," or thought his reasons for his refusal not "creditable to his judgment;" but though to resist the last sad argument of his friends well nigh broke his heart, we cannot doubt that an overruling Providence directed his decision. "And if we connect Mr. Wesley with that great work, which he was designed afterward to effect, we must shut out the doctrine of providence if we do not see a higher hand than that of man in his determination; a hand which is not the less certainly employed when it works its ends through the secret volitions, aversions, inclinations and even prejudices of the human heart, than when it more sensibly and immediately interposes to hasten or retard our purposes."* That Mr. Wesley was not influenced by motives of "selfishness," or any species of "religious egotism" in his decision, is conclusively proved by his acceptance, a few months later, of an appointment from the Trustees of Georgia to preach the gospel to the settlers and Indians in that new colony. This Macedonian cry from the wilds of America, associated as it was with the prospect of peril, privation, and suffering, was more attractive to the peculiar feelings of the young evangelist than an invitation to an opulent parish in England. The necessity of the case seems to have influenced his decision. There were many applicants for the living of Epworth, but few were willing to endure the hardships and sufferings connected with the life and labours of a missionary in the wilderness. To show the spirit with which he entered upon this mission, we place on record here his reply to one who said to him, "What is this, sir; are you one of the knights-errant? How, I pray, got Quixotism into your head? You want nothing; you have a good provision for life, and are in a way of preferment; and must you leave all to fight windmills—to convert savages in America?" He answered feelingly and calmly, "Sir, if the Bible be not true, I am as very a fool and madman as you can conceive; but if it be of God, I am sober-minded. For he has declared, 'There is no man that hath left house, or friends, or brether, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in the present time, and in the world to come everlasting life.'"

In Mr. Taylor's representation of the intercourse between Mr. Wesley and the Moravian brethren and its consequences, there are

* Watson.

some examples of what we are constrained to call flagrant misrepresentation—misrepresentation which, whether made in ignorance or wilfulness, deserves the sharpest and sternest reproof:—

“His spiritual confidence had received a death wound from the hand of the Moravian brethren.” . . . “He had been stripped of that overweening religiousness upon which as its basis his ascetic egotism had hitherto rested.” . . . “Wesley’s was a mind in the history of which no gradual transition periods—no seasons during which the understanding and the moral sentiments should in equipoised conjunction work their way onward from one position to another—could have place. Each change was either a leap from a precipice, or a being thrown with violence from one standing place to another; and the very next moment after he had regained his feet, or even before he could do so, he turned upon those whose company he had thus left, and assailed them with eager yet never with bitter upbraidings,” &c.—Pp. 38–40.

This we pronounce a palpable libel on the character and early religious history of Mr. Wesley. To speak thus of his “spiritual confidence,” and “overweening religiousness,” in the sense of pharisaism or self-righteousness, is to contradict the whole history of his early religious life. To vindicate this remark, a few extracts from his correspondence with his mother while he was at Oxford, and spoken of by ribald tongues as the “father of the holy club,” may be cited. He was often, says one of his biographers,* dull and formal in the use of ordinances, and was on that account thrown “into distress and perplexity,” so that he seemed at a loss which way to proceed to obtain the happiness and security he wanted. The deep tone of feeling, and the earnestness of his inquiries in the following extracts, present this state of his mind in a very affecting light. Addressing this guide of his youth, with reference to the advantages derived from participation in the holy sacrament, he says:—

“That none but worthy receivers should find this effect is not strange to me, when I observe how small effect many means of improvement have upon an unprepared mind. Mr. Morgan and my brother were affected, as they ought, by the observations you made on that glorious subject; but though my understanding approved what was excellent, yet my heart did not feel it. Why was this, but because it was preëngaged by those affections with which wisdom will not dwell? Because the animal mind cannot relish those truths which are spiritually discerned. Yet I have those writings which the good Spirit gave to that end! I have many of those which he hath since assisted his servants to give us; I have retirement to apply these to my own soul daily; I have means both of public and private prayer; and above all, of partaking in that sacrament once a week. What shall I do to make all these blessings effectual—to gain from them that mind which was also in Christ Jesus? To all who give signs of their not being strangers to it, I propose this question—and why not to you rather than any? You say, you have renounced the world. And what have I been doing all this time? What have I done ever since I was born? Why, I have been plunging myself into it more and more. It is enough:

* Whitehead.

awake thou that sleepest. Is there not one Lord, one Spirit, one hope of our calling? one way of attaining that hope? Then I am to renounce the world as well as you? That is the very thing I want to do: to draw off my affections from this world, and fix them on a better. But how? What is the surest and the shortest way? Is it not to be humble? Surely this is a large step in the way. But the question recurs, How am I to do this? To own the necessity of it, is not to be humble. In many things you have interceded for me and prevailed. Who knows but in this, too, you may be successful? If you can spare me only that little part of Thursday evening which you formerly bestowed upon me in another manner, I doubt not but it would be as useful now, for correcting my heart, as it was then for forming my judgment.

"When I observe how fast life flies away, and how slow improvement comes, I think one can never be too much afraid of dying before one has learned to live. I mean even in the course of nature. For were I sure that 'the silver cord should not be violently loosed;' that 'the wheel' should not be 'broken at the cistern,' till it was quite worn away by its own motion; yet what a time would this give me for such a work! a moment, to transact the business of eternity! What are forty years in comparison of this? So that, were I sure what never man yet was sure of, how little would it alter the case? How justly still might I cry out,

'Downward I hasten to my destined place;
There none obtain thy aid, none sing thy praise!
Soon shall I lie in death's deep ocean drown'd;
Is mercy there, is sweet forgiveness found?
O save me yet, while on the brink I stand;
Rebuke these storms, and set me safe on land.
O make my longings and thy mercy sure!
Thou art the God of power.'"

In further confirmation of the opinion we have advanced, we add a few extracts from Mr Wesley's Journal, showing his meekness and humility, and the deep conviction of his heart that in religious attainments he was far short of the true evangelical standard. These records were made before his acquaintance with the peculiar views of the Moravians, and some of them before the vessel in which they were fellow passengers had fairly taken her departure from port:—

"Friday, Oct. 31.—We sailed out of the Downs. At eleven at night I was waked by a great noise. I soon found there was no danger. But the bare apprehension of it gave me a lively conviction what manner of men those ought to be who are every moment on the brink of eternity."

"Sunday, Nov. 23.—At night I was waked by the tossing of the ship and roaring of the wind, and plainly showed I was unfit, for I was unwilling to die."

"Saturday, Jan. 17.—Many people were very impatient at the contrary wind. At seven in the evening they were quieted by a storm. It rose higher and higher till nine. About nine the sea broke over us from stem to stern; burst through the windows of the state cabin where three or four of us were, and covered us all over, though a bureau sheltered me from the main shock. About eleven I lay down in the great cabin and in a short time fell asleep, though very uncertain whether I should wake alive, and much ashamed of my unwillingness to die."

"Friday, 23.—In the evening another storm began. In the morning it increased, so that they were forced to let the ship drive. I could not but say to myself, 'How is it that thou hast no faith?'"

The tone, spirit, and matter of these extracts show that Mr. Wesley was a stranger to "spiritual confidence" and "overweening religiousness;" and the readiness and humility with which he sought and received instruction, equally prove his sincere desire to learn "the way of God more perfectly." It is not, therefore, true that he first learned from the Moravians that he was not a true Christian. He had at Oxford a most painful conviction that though he possessed the form, he had but little of the life and power of godliness. He had then a large measure of the "spirit of bondage unto fear," and that after which his perplexed heart panted was the "Spirit of adoption," by which he might cry "Abba, Father." *

But our author complains of the suddenness of the transitions with which Mr. Wesley passed from one stage of religious attainments to another; and, also, of his disposition to assail with eager upbraidings those he had left behind in the race. Mr. Wesley himself affirms that the change referred to was the result of more than ten years of earnest and incessant struggling. If this be deemed a sudden transition, it might be interesting to know what is considered a gradual one, "during which the understanding and the moral sentiments should, in equipoised conjunction, work their way onward from one position to another." And in view of his severe criticism upon Mr. Wesley's sudden change, and his disposition to assail those he had left behind with eager upbraidings, it would be equally interesting to know in what light a man "possessed of the philosophic faculty" would regard the conversion and subsequent career of the Apostle Paul. He, we think, passed through a transition somewhat more sudden than that of Mr. Wesley, and he was at least equally prompt to assail the company he had left with eager upbraidings.

Field preaching, and the earnest and heroic spirit of Wesley and his associates, receive a qualified approbation in the book before us; but the former seems alone to be made accountable for the "bodily agitations and outwardly expressed agonies that were frequently excited in their audiences." Whitefield, it is said, "when these occurred in his presence, stood in doubt as to the source to which they should be attributed. He saw in them no indubitable indications of the hand of God. He looked for such fruits of his preaching as are of a less questionable kind." But as Wesley is contrasted with him in this respect, the inevitable inference is, that *he did see* in them the "indubitable indications of the hand of God," and "looked for them as the most desirable fruits of his preaching." And it is directly averred that it was "his too ready

acceptance of these supposed proofs of the presence of God, that tended to produce and to aggravate them."

Nothing could be more unmanly or unjust than this gross and unfounded imputation upon the character of the sainted dead. That strange and wonderful mental and physical exhibitions sometimes attended the preaching of the early Methodist evangelists is readily admitted, but that these were in any sense peculiar to Methodism has been repeatedly and peremptorily denied. And that Mr. Wesley "saw in them the hand of God, and looked for them as the most desirable fruits of his preaching," is a transparent invention, the weakness of which is only equalled by its wickedness. Statements like this must neutralize any influence the book might otherwise exert upon persons of the least intelligence, for it will be rightly argued by thoughtful minds, that he who can wilfully and deliberately coin a falsehood so easily exposed by a reference to history is entirely unworthy of respect or confidence. Were it necessary, and did our limits permit, we might easily quote Mr. Wesley's opinions at length on this topic, showing conclusively, that so far from entertaining views similar to those alleged, he habitually discouraged such exhibitions, looking upon them with suspicion and disapprobation. "The head and front of his offending" in this respect consists in having recorded in his Journals accounts of these extraordinary developments; but the most malicious vilifier of his name cannot furnish a *single sentence*, intimating even indirectly that he approved them, much less that "he saw in them indubitable indications of the hand of God, and looked for them as the most desirable fruits of his preaching." It has been truly said, that it is difficult to meet with a divine whose views of religion are more practical and definite than those of Mr. Wesley.

The separation between Wesley and Whitefield is accounted for in a philosophical manner, strikingly characteristic of our author. He thinks it impossible that they could have continued to labour together and address the same congregations, because:—1. Wesley's Arminianism was less liberal than Whitefield's Calvinism! The theology of the former was "cramped," and "walled up as it were to heaven,"—that of the latter open and ample, "placing him on a wider and more elevated ground." 2. "Wesley had caught hold of the paradox of 'perfection,' which, in the form in which he first announced and defined it, prevented any *thoughtful* colleague" from moving on harmoniously by his side. 3. "The difference concerning the 'election of grace,' necessitated in a still more peremptory manner the separation of the two friends"

Yet had they been philosophers or thinking men, the separation, it seems, might have been avoided, for the author thinks

"Everything for which a Calvinist, not fanatical, would contend, is embraced within the compass of Mr. Wesley's own preaching language!" "And though he rejected the 'election of grace,' on account of its inseparable alliance, as he supposed, with reprobation, yet in so doing he fought a wordy phantom, for no Calvinist ever insisted with more force or point than he did upon the facts of this awful condition."—Pp. 52, 53.

Does the reader think this an impeachment of Mr. Wesley's candor? By no means. The author, "in this as in many other similar instances, easily saves his reputation, as a thoroughly honest disputant, by alleging his entire want of the deep reflective or analytic faculty."

The chapters on lay preaching and lay preachers, with the one containing a laboured comparison between Methodism and Romanism, contain but little worthy of observation. We find indeed, the reiteration in various forms of the unfounded assumptions that "Mr. Wesley himself cherished and fomented, as well among preachers and people, tendencies which it should have been his part to repress. Not seldom it was he rather than they that set reason at defiance, and forgot sobriety in extravagance and wildness," &c.; and that Wesley's creed was not orthodox. The first of these we have already refuted, and to the last we shall presently reply.

We have now reached the chapter in which Mr. Wesley is considered as the founder of an "institute." This, it is affirmed, "*was not*, and *is not* a Church, nor did he himself so designate it." "The Wesleyan societies were constituted for the one purpose of gathering and retaining converts," &c. The writer labours through many dull pages to convince his readers that Wesley intended his "institute" to serve a transient or temporary purpose only. His arguments are drawn from his reluctance to separate from the Establishment, and from the assumed fact that his organization did not provide for the "cure of souls," an essential element of a Church, and a duty which it is deemed by the author impossible to discharge with an itinerant ministry. That the pastoral office could not be efficiently discharged, when the founder of Methodism was engaged in travelling extensively, and was aided by few assistants, may be readily granted; but the force of this objection is very greatly diminished, if it does not entirely disappear, when the preacher remains stationary for two or three years. That the objection, however, is quite imaginary, and never had any real existence after Methodism was organized and became a working system, is admitted by the author himself, who elsewhere gives

to this "institute" high praise for the faithful discharge of the duty, for which, he says, it makes no provision:—

"The Episcopal Church, in its several offices, assumes the existence and the efficiency of a universally extended religious training; and it is on the ground of this hypothesis that these offices are susceptible of a good and Scriptural interpretation. But as this (supposed) cure of souls—intended to embrace the community, from the first weeks of life to its close—had fallen into desuetude, and had quite ceased to be a fact, Wesleyanism deserves high praise (apart from its merit as a mission to the irreligious) on this ground, and because it supplied so sad a lack of service on the part of the Church."—P. 217.

So, then, it may be logically inferred from the author's own premises, that the Establishment, with all its furniture of a settled and salaried ministry, is less entitled on this ground to the dignified title of Church, than the despised "institute" of Wesley.

The several chapters of this book devoted particularly to Charles Wesley, Whitefield, Fletcher, Coke, and Lady Huntingdon, we pass by as connected only indirectly with the main object of the author.

From the chapter entitled the "Methodistic Company," we transcribe some important admissions, which are a sufficient refutation of the charges of a "cramped," "defective theology,"—"that Methodism, such as Wesley made it, was girt about too tightly,"—"that there is at the bottom of Methodism some misunderstanding of Christianity,"—that, "had Wesley been less argumentative and less categorical, and more meditative, he would have set Methodism upon a broader theological basis,"—with several expressions of a similar character, which are scattered profusely through the work:—

"Until the contrary can be clearly proved, it may be affirmed that no company of men, of whose labours and doctrines we have any sufficient notice, has gone forth with a creed more distinctly orthodox, or more exempt from admixture of the doctrinal feculence of an earlier time. None have stood forward more free than these were from petty solitudes concerning matters of observance, to which, whether they were to be upheld or to be denounced, an exaggerated importance was attributed. None have confined themselves more closely to those principal subjects which bear directly upon the relationship of man to God—as immortal, accountable, guilty, and redeemed. If we are tempted to complain of the unvaried complexion of the Methodistic teaching, it is the uniformity which results from a close adherence to the rudiments of the gospel. Uniformity, or sameness of aspect, as it may be the colouring of dulness and of death, so may it spring from simplicity and power; but can it be a question to which of these sources we should attribute that undiversified breadth which is the characteristic of Methodism?" "Need it be said that these Methodists were men 'of like passions with ourselves?' and such, too, were those who, in the apostolic age, carried the gospel throughout the Roman world and beyond it. Taken in the mass, the one company of men was as wise as the other—not wiser—as holy, not more holy. If it be affirmed that the Christian worthies of some remote time were, as a class of men, of a loftier stature in virtue and piety than these with whom we have

now to do, let the evidence on which such an assumption could be made to rest be brought forward: this can never be done; and the supposition itself should be rejected as a puerile superstition."—Pp. 128, 129.

If, as the author here affirms, Wesley and his companions, as a class, were as wise and holy as those selected by the Saviour to be the heralds of his gospel to the world, we cannot doubt their competency to place the "institute" they formed upon an economical and theological basis truly Scriptural, or even to establish a Church.

Four chapters of this book are devoted to an elaborate analysis of the substance of Methodism. The prejudices of the sectarian appear for a moment to be laid aside, and the investigation is conducted with a marked degree of skill and ability. Notwithstanding the many imputations, innuendos, and direct aspersions employed in other parts of the book to impeach the soundness of the Methodist doctrines, the following statement stands prominently at the head of this discussion:—

"Methodism was not a new theology, or a polemical affirmation of dogmas, contravening or adding to that system of belief which had been embodied two centuries before in the articles and confessions of the several Protestant Churches. . . . And yet, while the theology is entirely what we recognise as the authentic belief of the Protestant Church, the product of the Methodist ministrations, that is to say, the general or average product, apart from what might be attributed to the oratorical powers of individual preachers, was such as has no parallel even in the most exciting moments of the Reformation; nor has it had any parallel in these later times. We are called upon, therefore, to show what it was which constituted the visible difference—vast as it is."—Pp. 137, 138.

How well our author understood the subject, and how far it had assumed a consistent and systematic form in his mind will appear from the results of his inquiry. We condense his answer to the question, "What was Methodism?"

1. "It was a waking up of a consciousness toward Almighty God, which gave a meaning to expressions of Scriptural doctrine," &c.
2. "It was a consciousness of the relationship of God the Father of spirits to the individual spirit."
3. "A vivid consciousness of the mediatorial scheme; a lively sense of that great truth that God has prepared a full, free, and complete salvation for all men, and which may in this life—this very hour—be entered upon, and enjoyed by every obedient soul."
4. "Evangelical philanthropy." These our author regards as the elements of the power and success of early Methodism. It may seem to some that he travels in a circle ending where he begins, with a simple description of the effects of the Methodist preaching, while the occult or hidden causes of its power remain undeveloped; but if, with his exhibition of its machinery and various adjustments, we distinctly recognize the hand of God as the motive

power, (as the author really does,) we shall have but little to object to his analysis of the substance of Methodism.

To approve the "form" of Wesleyan Methodism as a scheme of "evangelic aggression," falls in with the author's purpose, and this feature in its organization is treated with commendable fairness and liberality. He thinks it necessary, however, to disclaim any intention of "schooling the extant Wesleyan body," or "advising the conference." Of course! He approves of Methodism as an aggressive agent upon the territories of ungodliness; but he wishes to suggest to the preachers and the great Wesleyan body, that its mission is about accomplished, and that the time has come to gather in the harvest and secure it within the pale of the Establishment. We mean not to intimate that he uses this language, but that all he says plainly suggests it in substance.

This will more clearly appear as we proceed with the author to the examination of Methodism in its various aspects, "as a system of religious discipline and instruction, as toward the people," "as a hierarchy or scheme of spiritual government," and as a "corporation or establishment."

Under the first head he insists that an itinerant must be less qualified than a settled ministry, to instruct the people, and discharge efficiently the duties of the pastoral office, and draws the inference that Wesleyanism is an economy for a time, and that the Christianity it teaches will be always immature and superficial. We are inclined to dispute both his premises and his conclusion.

That an errant evangelist in the strict sense of that word—one really homeless and constantly on the wing—has no such opportunities for prosecuting the study of books as one at rest possesses, with the various and valuable facilities which favourable circumstances may supply, cannot and need not be disputed. This, however, is not the Wesleyan itinerancy of the present, or even of former times. An itinerant in the Wesleyan sense is not an errant ministry. The author has evoked a phantom and beats the air. The Wesleyan preacher occupies the same field of labour from one to three years, generally the latter, and he is not necessarily absent from his home or books more than the settled pastor of a large parish. And these stated removals have not so much tendency to beget an unsettled state of mind, or to disturb studious habits as the regularly recurring vacations in college have to produce similar effects upon students and professors.

Indeed, if we consider how much of each week must necessarily be devoted to preparation for the Sabbath by the settled minister, whatever may be his inclination or opportunities for study—a burden

from which the itinerant may escape as often as he will, by reproducing, amended and improved or otherwise, a sermon already preached in another charge, the conclusion seems easy and natural that the opportunities for study and mental improvement must be in favour of the latter. If the pulpits of those denominations whose occupants may "ruminate under the conditions of a tranquil ministerial fixedness," have in a great measure lost their hold upon the thoughtful and intelligent, as well as upon the masses of the people, and sermons are now rarely remembered beyond the moment when the foot reaches the last step at the church doors; may not this lamentable result be traced to the necessarily crude and superficial character of those semi-weekly or even tri-weekly productions which are "got up" amid the interruptions of manifold parish duties, and are always prepared under the pressure of present necessity? The itinerant, when he enters upon a new field of labour, may go back and review the ground over which he has passed, subject his former productions to a critical reëxamination, and thus be prepared to furnish his hearers with the results of his labour in their most complete and attractive form. Not so the settled minister, from whom is required his "tale of bricks"—his two or three written sermons per week. He can rarely prepare a discourse with that care and research, which his own reputation, or the best interest of his flock demands. He must frequently deny himself the profit and gratification of tracing trains of thought to their sources, or pursuing a subject to its remote consequences. He must ignore all subjects which will not furnish a page for his Sunday's homily, and finished, perhaps at the last hour, he has no time for revision or correction, but must carry it to the pulpit, and pronounce it there, with all its imperfections. An artist with a ready hand will throw off perhaps two or three pictures a week, but they will not establish his fame, or be sought after by posterity. The spectator may perhaps give them a momentary examination, and then without emotion he dismisses them from his mind; but the picture before which he lingers and gazes entranced, and the vision of which returns in after time, is the product of protracted study and patient toil. The itinerant may exemplify this truth in the opportunities he possesses to return again and again to some important theme, until, after having scanned its heights and fathomed its depths, he presents it in glowing language to delighted audiences, who hang with intense interest upon his lips, and eagerly drink in the words of life. But the settled minister, moving in a contracted sphere, possesses no such means for the profound examination of a subject, or for rendering his acquirements so extensively beneficial. Driven onward perpetually

by the remorseless demand of his people for new sermons, he either breaks down under his burden, or grinds on monotonously like a horse in a mill. There are some prominent exceptions—some men of preëminent talent who endure the system, and like the arch appear to grow stronger by the pressure upon them—but that these are the general results of the two systems none can doubt who have had opportunities of comparing the attractive freshness, originality and power of the one class, with the prosy monotony, and superficial tameness of the other.

The argument which proves that the itinerant is really more favourably situated for thorough study than the settled minister, is sufficient to show that there is nothing in the system to prevent him from discharging with equal facility and success the duties of the pastoral office. Indeed, the duty of becoming acquainted with his people would, if additional inducements were necessary, well nigh compel him to circulate freely among his flock. If we add the auxiliary of the class-meeting, which is designed to facilitate the discharge of pastoral duties, and which it is the preacher's duty to attend, we may safely affirm that no people enjoy so efficient and thorough pastoral oversight as the Methodists. And we rejoice to say that no soil has more bountifully repaid the husbandman's toil. Among no people has the gospel been more fruitful. Among no people is there enjoyed a higher average of vital piety; and none are better instructed in both the theory and practice of Scriptural Christianity. The meekness, humility, self-denying zeal, unwavering fidelity, and active benevolence of the followers of Wesley are proverbial; and the "best of all is, God is with us," and "our people die well."

A leading object of the author is to show that Mr. Wesley neither formed nor intended to form a Church, but that he simply regarded his society as a kind of adjunct, or evangelizing supplement to the Established Church.

His arguments are these:—1st. "Mr. Wesley called his 'institute' a 'society,' not a Church." 2d. "The laity are not recognised in his 'institute,' a neglect for which he would have provided had he designed to establish a Church." 3d. "Had he designed to form a Church, it would have been a copy of the Establishment, which he regarded as the model of a Scriptural Church." Our prescribed limits compel us to dispose of these topics in few words. The real state of the case seems to be this:—At the outset of Mr. Wesley's career his single design doubtless was to promote the life and power of godliness within the prescribed sphere of a minister of the Church of England. But when the churches were closed against him, and he began to meet opposition and persecution from the ministers of

that communion, he felt constrained to go forward in his work without regard to Church order, or the approval of Church authorities. Access to the churches having been refused him, he went out into "the highways and hedges," and in the open air proclaimed "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." In process of time, as the work extended and embraced thousands who had never been connected in any sense with the national Church, the question of a separate organization began to be agitated, both among preachers and people. He, from first to last, remained an ordained minister of the Establishment, from which he refused to separate. But from the first gathering of his societies he believed they were clothed with all the attributes of a Church, and that his "helpers" were in every sense ministers of the Church of Christ, and authorized to administer the sacraments, and to perform all the functions pertaining to that office.

The Nineteenth Article of Religion is in the following words:—"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." It is perfectly clear that, with the single exception of the administration of the sacraments, the Wesleyan body was a Church according to the views of the English Church herself. But it can very easily be shown that Mr. Wesley believed his "helpers," after being set apart to the sacred office, according to the mode practised in the Methodist body, to be *ordained* to the ministry. "They were not appointed to expound or preach merely, but were solemnly set apart to the pastoral office, as the minutes of the conference show; nor were they regarded by him as laymen, or considered lay preachers, except when in common parlance they were distinguished from the clergy of the Church, in which case he would have called any dissenting minister a layman." In truth, as early as 1746, and indeed before that time, his opinions

"Were such as show, that though he was a Church-of-England man as to affection, which was strong and sincere as far as its doctrines and its liturgy were concerned, and though he regarded it with deference as a legal institution, yet in respect of its ecclesiastical *polity* he was even then very free in his opinions. At the second conference in 1745 it was asked, 'Is Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent Church government, most agreeable to reason?' The answer is as follows:—

"The plain origin of Church government seems to be this:—Christ sends forth a person to preach the gospel: some of those who hear him, repent and believe in Christ: they then desire him to watch over them, to build them up in faith, and to guide their souls into paths of righteousness. Here, then, is an independent congregation, subject to no pastor but their own; neither liable

to be controlled, in things spiritual, by any other man, or body of men whatsoever. But soon after, some from other parts, who were occasionally present, while he was speaking in the name of the Lord, beseech him to come over and help them also. He complies, yet not till he confers with the wisest and holiest of his congregation; and with their consent appoints one who has gifts and grace to watch over his flock in his absence. If it please God to raise another flock, in the new place, before he leaves them, he does the same thing, appointing one whom God hath fitted for the work to watch over these souls also. In like manner, in every place where it pleases God to gather a little flock by his word, he appoints one in his absence to take the oversight of the rest, to assist them as of the ability which God giveth.

"These are deacons, or servants of the Church, and they look upon their first pastor as the common father of all these congregations, and regard him in the same light, and esteem him still as the shepherd of their souls. These congregations are not strictly independent, as they depend upon one pastor, though not upon each other.

"As these congregations increase, and the deacons grow in years and grace, they need other subordinate deacons, or helpers, in respect of whom they may be called presbyters, or elders, as their father in the Lord may be called the bishop or overseer of them all."

"This passage is important, as it shows that from the first he regarded his preachers, when called out and devoted to the work, as, in respect of primitive antiquity and the universal Church, parallel to deacons and presbyters. He also then thought himself a Scriptural bishop. Lord King's researches into antiquity served to confirm these sentiments, and corrected his former notion as to a distinction of orders.

"It should here be stated, that at these early conferences one sitting appears to have been devoted to conversation on matters of discipline, in which the propriety of Mr. Wesley's proceedings in former societies, calling out preachers, and originating a distinct religious community, governed by its own laws, were considered; and this necessarily led to the examination of general questions of Church government and order. This will explain the reason why in the conferences which Mr. Wesley, his brother, two or three clergymen, and a few preachers, held in the years 1744, 1745, 1746, and 1747, such subjects were discussed as are contained in the above extract and in those which follow. On these, as on all others, they set out with the principle of examining everything 'to the foundation.'

"Q. Can he be a spiritual governor of the Church who is not a believer, nor a member of it?

"A. It seems not; though he may be a governor in outward things, by a power derived from the king.

"Q. What are properly the laws of the Church of England?

"A. The rubrics; and to these we submit, as the ordinance of men, for the Lord's sake.

"Q. But is not the will of our governors a law?

"A. No; not of any governor, temporal or spiritual: therefore if any bishop wills that I should not preach the gospel, his will is no law to me.

"Q. But if he produce a law against your preaching?

"A. I am to obey God rather than man."

"Q. Is mutual consent absolutely necessary between the pastor and his flock?

"A. No question. I cannot guide any soul, unless he consent to be guided by me; neither can any soul force me to guide him, if I consent not.

"Q. Does the ceasing of this consent on either side dissolve this relation?

"A. It must in the very nature of things. If a man no longer consent to

be guided by me, I am no longer his guide; I am free. If one will not guide me any longer, I am free to seek one who will.'

"Q. Does a Church in the New Testament always mean a single congregation?

"A. We believe it does; we do not recollect any instance to the contrary.

"Q. What instance or ground is there in the New Testament for a national Church.

"A. We know none at all; we apprehend it to be a merely political institution.

"Q. Are the three orders of bishops, priests and deacons, plainly described in the New Testament?

"A. We think they are, and believe they generally obtained in the Church of the apostolic age.

"Q. But are you assured that God designed the same plan should obtain in all Churches, throughout all ages?

"A. We are not assured of it, because we do not know it is asserted in holy writ.

"Q. If the plan were essential to a Christian Church, what must become of all foreign reformed Churches?

"A. It would follow they are no part of the Church of Christ: a consequence full of shocking absurdity.

"Q. In what age was the divine right of episcopacy first asserted in England?

"A. About the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign: till then all the bishops and clergy in England continually allowed and joined in the ministrations of those who were not episcopally ordained.

"Q. Must there not be numberless accidental variations in the government of various Churches?

"A. There must, in the nature of things. As God variously dispenses his gifts of nature, providence, and grace, both the offices themselves, and the officers in each, ought to be varied from time to time.

"Q. Why is it that there is no determinate plan of Church government appointed in Scripture?

"A. Without doubt because the wisdom of God had a regard to that necessary variety.

"Q. Was there any thought of uniformity in the government of all Churches, until the time of Constantine?

"A. It is certain there was not."

It is well known that Mr. Wesley steadily objected to give his ministers generally in England the liberty to administer the sacraments; but this was a prudential measure merely, and arose not from any doubt in his own mind of the validity of their ordination. His reason is clearly stated in his letter to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and the brethren in the United States. "I have still refused" [to give liberty to administer the sacraments,] "not only for peace' sake, but because I was determined as little as possible to violate the established order of the national Church to which I belonged." He, however, did appoint ministers for America, and afterward for Scotland, with full authority to baptize and administer the Lord's supper; and although the appointment was conferred by imposition of hands, yet this ceremony did not, in his opinion, increase the validity of

their ordination, for when within the territories of England this new privilege ceased. To show that Mr. Wesley did not believe the ceremony of imposition of hands necessary to ordination, as well as his conviction of the possession of full powers on the part of his "helpers," when they were received into "full connexion" by conference, it may be stated that, on one occasion at least, he gave a "helper" leave to baptize and give the Lord's supper under peculiar circumstances, and when in Dublin he allowed two others to assist in the eucharist, to the great offence of the Church people there.

In the Wesleyan Conference this question was effectually set at rest at the very first session after the death of Mr. Wesley. Some of the members, at that time, were disposed, perhaps, to assume some superiority over their brethren, on account of the imposition of Mr. Wesley's hands subsequent to the ordinary appointment by him when received into the body. But the conference regarded such pretensions as absurd, and adopted the views of Mr. Benson, who proved from the New Testament that the imposition of hands in ordination was merely a circumstance, which, though it might increase the impressiveness of the ceremony, added nothing to its validity, and he showed to the satisfaction of the body that they had always possessed a ministry scripturally, and therefore validly ordained.

It appears, therefore, that Mr. Wesley's societies, in effect, possessed all the powers of a Christian Church, according to the "Articles" of the Establishment itself; and that he formed it upon what he believed to be the exact model of the primitive Church. The whole case may be thus stated:—Mr. Wesley loved "The Church" much, but he loved the cause of God more; and when he was admonished by his brother of the inevitable tendency of the societies toward separation, and urged to require from the preachers some specific pledge of adherence to the Church, he refused, observing, "Church or no Church, we must attend to the work of saving souls. I neither set it up nor pull it down, but let you and me build the city of God."

It would not be difficult for one acquainted with the various assaults which the Methodistic economy has survived, to trace the author's views, as developed in this book, to the sources whence they might have been derived. There is in them nothing really new, and yet he writes as if he was exploring a new field and announcing newly discovered truths; never even intimating that all his objections have been very frequently urged before, and as frequently answered and refuted. He is, probably, not very familiar with the literature of Methodism. The sole authorities to which he refers are the Journals of Wesley, and the Minutes of the Conference.

Either, therefore, he has not read what has been written on the topics he discusses, or his candour and magnanimity are not to be commended.

Our purpose thus far has been to vindicate the truth of history, and place on record a refutation of an arrogant but insidious attack upon a system which we both venerate and love. We have, of course, viewed this work from the Methodistic stand-point; and what we have written will doubtless prove less interesting to others than to those who bear the Wesleyan name. But we have yet a grave charge to prefer against the author, in which the whole Christian world is equally interested.

He is apparently so completely fascinated with the idea of "progress," and so infatuated with the charms of a subtle idealistic philosophy, and he makes such high pretensions of dwelling in a calmer and purer region, where "things may be viewed from above," that he has quite lost all respect for plain, old-fashioned orthodoxy. He earnestly insists upon the notion that the received doctrines of Scripture, as well as the established laws of interpretation, are effete and antiquated; and that the time is coming when "fresh minds, applying the unsophisticated energy of their understandings to these problems, will reach ground which they will know to be immovable." "A doctrine," he says, "as well as an agency is now called for." What is needed is, a "belief derived *anew* from Scripture, by bringing to bear upon this difficult subject a reformed principle of Biblical interpretation."—P. 289. We, he affirms, do not yet know either what is meant by inspiration, or how to interpret the writings which we call inspired; but in the better time coming, men will be raised up to do this work of peculiar difficulty. It will, however, involve "the breaking up of many inveterate superstitions, and the dissipation of many cherished illusions." Then, however, songs of triumph may be sung; for a revolution will be effected in theological science analogous to that effected in physical science by the promulgation of the Baconian philosophy.

These are the favourite ideas of the so-called "modern philosophers." That the Scriptures must be interpreted, and well-established doctrines remodelled, to suit the "progress of the age," is a mischievous and monstrous notion. Its tendency must be to unsettle all existing forms of belief, and to send the Church adrift without compass or chart, on the turbulent sea of infidel philosophy. If such be the vision presented to him, who, by the exercise of the "philosophic faculty" has reached a "higher level," and "looks at things from above," we opine that ordinary mortals will prefer to contemplate them "standing on earth—not rapt above the sky."

We take leave to add a few words on the subject of the recognition of the laity in the system of Mr. Wesley. The author in this part of his work is evidently engaged in a labour of love, and, assuming facts to suit his theory, he appears to wage a successful war with the monster he has conjured up. Few familiar with the Wesleyan system will be deceived by his misrepresentations, or disturbed by his assaults. We are content to leave the controversy as it stands, quite satisfied that Wesleyan Methodism has been successfully vindicated; but we discern some faint tokens that an attempt may be made in this country, and among ourselves, to renew the war on the old issues; and we therefore leave English Wesleyanism for a moment, to speak a word on this question in its application to Wesleyanism in America. There are those among us apparently so charmed with the name of progress, that they are ready to condemn old things merely because they are old, and confounding innovation with reform, would "advance backward" sooner than abide by our present landmarks; to whom what is venerable and embalmed in a thousand cherished associations, presents no claim to affection or respect, but who would rashly tamper with a system whose beautiful adjustments, and efficient and successful workings, have wrought out such noble results for our race.

Whether this be thoughtless folly, or the wicked recklessness of prurient ambition, it merits rebuke and castigation. When, as in the case of the author before us, an enemy does this, it may be borne; but when his groundless objections and stale arguments are repeated and endorsed by those whose position and power are the legitimate fruits of the system they disparage, their course awakens mingled emotions of contempt and indignation.

Nothing can be more unjust than the assumption, that on the question of what is called "lay representation" in our conferences, there is controversy between our preachers and people. Yet it is unblushingly affirmed that it is a question of the rights of the laity in opposition to priestly domination. We believe there is no antagonism whatever between the preachers and people on this subject. The aim of both has been, so to adjust the system that the popular element should have power to promote, not to impede, the ministerial functions. Though an abstract principle may underlie the question, and be involved in the discussion, yet we think all parties interested are disposed to consider it in the light of expediency only. And when a majority, or even a respectable minority of our laymen, shall believe that a lay representation in our conferences will add to the efficiency of our system, their views will be calmly considered, and our polity be made to conform to what may seem best calculated to

accomplish the design for which the Church was organized. But we are disposed to doubt, notwithstanding our author's glowing eulogies, that Wesleyanism, either in England or America, will adopt his favourite "Establishment" as a model, in any modifications which they may hereafter make.

Our author is a comparatively recent accession to the English Church from the ranks of Independency, and some slight extravagance in the expression of his first love may easily be forgiven. But that a man of sense and discrimination, and the advocate of popular representation in the councils of the Church, should condemn Wesleyanism for the priestly despotism of her polity, and laud the Establishment for her liberality, is the very infatuation of sectarianism.

ART. II.—THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS.

1. *The Plurality of Worlds.* With an Introduction by EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., of Amherst College. A new edition, to which is added a Supplementary Dialogue, in which the author's reviewers are reviewed. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.
2. *More Worlds than One, the Creed of the Philosopher and the Hope of the Christian.* By Sir DAVID BREWSTER, K. H., D. C. L. New-York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

It is one of the inseparable incidents of the progress of knowledge, that old opinions should from time to time be brought up for re-examination, and that beliefs long cherished should be sternly challenged anew as to the grounds on which they rest. The publication, within the past year, of the two works we have named, written by two of the most competent scholars of the age, proves that it is possible to awaken a deep interest in the profoundest philosophical inquiries. To grapple with the great question now brought forward, as these eminent writers have done, to bring into the discussion such vast stores of learning, to task in the handling of the subject such noble powers of reasoning, and to secure for such a controversy so great attention from leading writers, and so much general interest as to call for new editions in both hemispheres, is surely a hopeful sign of the intellectuality of our age, and a proof that the immense advance of material science is not causing a disregard of the more profound departments of knowledge.

It is not the design of this essay to present an analysis of the

arguments on either side, or even a summary statement of the respective theories or positions. It will be enough if we shall be able to awaken so much interest in the subject, as to induce our readers to study the books themselves, as the best exponents of their authors, while we proceed to offer a few independent considerations on the great question, Are the heavenly bodies inhabited?

The question whether the heavenly bodies—the planets, the sun, and the fixed stars—are inhabited like the earth, is now first opened as a subject of scientific inquiry. In all ages almost there have not been wanting vague imaginations, poetical dreams, or superstitious pretensions to supernatural knowledge on this subject. It was not until after the Newtonian philosophy had proved the planets to be material globes of vast extent, subject to the same laws of motion with the earth, that the idea of their being inhabited assumed the more digested and methodical form of a theory. Such theories were put forth, and maintained with arguments, more or less valid, during the latter part of the seventeenth century, based upon the then newly-discovered knowledge concerning the laws of gravity in the planets. But for more than one hundred and fifty years afterward no philosophical writer produced anything like a formal discussion of the question.

The reception gained by these ideas in the philosophic world can hardly be termed assent—certainly it was not conviction, which results from a weighing of arguments, a consideration of objections, a removal of difficulties, terminating in a positive decision of the judgment, determined by the preponderance of reasons in one direction. No traces are found in the annals of philosophy of any such processes of deliberation and conclusion. The theory was passively acquiesced in—have it so, if you will—from the lack of perceived reasons to the contrary, and still more from absolute indifference to its truth or falsehood. Either way, what difference did it make in the determination of any other problem in which mankind were interested? Or, so far as it was deemed a question that could ever become important, its solution was adjourned for a further hearing and for more light—supposing that the researches of the future might furnish additional data for its solution.

If the idea itself is found here and there in the writings of philosophers having a valuable reputation, it is put forth slightly, or obviously as a revived or traditionary supposition, or a dimly-seen and faintly-suggested analogy, and not as a matter of settled and philosophical deduction, challenging belief upon its merits. But while philosophy was treating it as a matter without present interest, it at length obtained a conventional importance on account of its

supposed relations to theology. Some infidel writer either made, or was imagined to have made, an objection against the divine origin of Christianity, on the ground that it was inconsistent with the wisdom of the Creator to expend so much of his care upon one small planet, as to hinge the success of his government upon the results to be obtained here, when there was before him a wilderness or a universe of similar bodies more worthy of his attention. A distinguished and highly-imaginative divine, about forty years ago, set up this supposed argument of infidelity, as a worthy target for his theological artillery, and to his own satisfaction most triumphantly demolished it, by a series of "Astronomical Discourses," the brilliancy of which served to render their leading doctrine widely popular as a literary sentiment, if not as a religious truth. But in all this time the subject has never elicited twenty pages of proper philosophical examination. No systems of philosophy, no transactions of philosophical societies, no magazines of philosophy, no treatises of philosophers, no collection of the posthumous writings of distinguished writers, contain the semblance of a digested and earnest inquiry on this question. As a real question, as a subject of actual discussion and solution, on which philosophers were to adopt convictions, or to form settled opinions, for which they were to be able to give philosophical reasons, it is fair to say that it has never been brought before the world until the present time. The year 1854 has witnessed the publication of two works, one on either side of the question, written by authors of established repute, and filled with elaborate learning and argument. And these works, with the comments of reviews and other periodicals, have awakened so much attention that both have required a reprint to meet the public demand. The question is up for discussion, and the public mind has gained an interest in the debate. Let it be fairly met and fully handled, in a free and open field, with the earnest conviction that there is no real interest at stake but in the knowledge of the truth.

Are the heavenly bodies inhabited?—The question is a simple one, and should not be complicated with other themes. It challenges attention as a question of fact, and should be met and argued on the same principles on which other facts are inquired into and settled. The supposition is to be received and admitted for a fact, just as far it is proved to be true or probable, and no further. If it is proved to be true, it is to be believed, like all other proved truth, and our opinions and beliefs on other related subjects are to be adjusted into conformity. If it is rendered probable, it is

entitled to a regard exactly proportioned to the degree of probability which a fair examination shall establish. If it appears to be wholly unsustained by such evidence as we justly require on such subjects, then it ought to be classed along with other mere dreams of the human imagination, which we never think of bringing into association with the received truths of science and religion. It is unworthy of a philosopher, it is unbecoming in a Christian, to admit mere speculations into the sacred circle of received truths. No man can do it who cherishes a proper estimate for truth as truth. No man can indulge in such error, without deteriorating the capacity of his own mind for the reception of truth and the rejection of error.

It is a misfortune to science that the two distinguished writers who have undertaken this discussion have not brought forward the question in this direct and simple form, as a question of fact. Both of them have chosen to follow in the track of Chalmers, and to present the subject in its supposed relation to the evidences of Christianity. Properly speaking, the question has nothing to do with the evidences of Christianity. If the heavenly bodies should be proved to be the abodes of races of rational beings, it would not destroy a single argument in favour of Christianity, nor weaken a single impression of its importance. As in the cases of astronomy and geology, and mineralogy and chemistry, the evidences of Christianity are never shaken by any progress of scientific discovery. And if the conclusion should finally be, that there is no ground for supposing those bodies to be inhabited, not a single iota of the Christian religion will suffer. If the Bible has any bearings on the question of fact, these are to receive their proper regard. But the main question should be considered on its own merits, and determined by its own evidences. We will try ourselves to keep to the question,—*Are the heavenly bodies inhabited?*

Let it be borne in mind in this inquiry, that the burden of proof is with the affirmative. No man can be required to prove the negative, nor to assent to the affirmative except as it is properly proved to be true. Whoever approaches this inquiry *de novo* cannot but be struck at first with the circumstance that the advocates of the doctrine have not, and do not pretend to adduce a particle of direct evidence in its favour. No man has ever seen, no telescope has ever disclosed the slightest trace of the existence of living beings, or of their works, even in the nearest of those bodies. It is stated that, by the best of the modern great telescopes, observers can examine portions of the moon's surface as small as a square mile, and can discern the differences of color, and the form of its surface. But no

trace has been found of vegetation, or of such changes in the appearance of the surface as human industry is wont to produce upon the earth. The supposition rests for its support wholly upon the argument from analogy. We find the argument stated in the opening paragraph of "More Worlds than One," in a very comprehensive manner:—

"There is no subject within the whole range of knowledge so universally interesting as that of a plurality of worlds. It commands the sympathies, and appeals to the judgment of men of all nations, of all creeds, and of all times; and no sooner do we comprehend the few simple facts on which it rests, than the mind rushes instinctively to embrace it. Before the great truths of astronomy were demonstrated, before the dimensions and motions of the planets were ascertained, and the fixed stars were placed at inconceivable distances from the system to which we belong, philosophers and poets described in the celestial spheres the abodes of the blest; but it was not till the form, and size, and motions of the earth were known, and till the condition of the other planets was found to be the same, that analogy compelled us to believe that these planets must be inhabited like our own."

"The few simple facts on which it rests" are those which are here given, to wit, that "the condition of the other planets," as to their "form, and size, and motions," are so like those of the earth, as to establish an analogy sufficient to *compel the belief* that "these planets must be inhabited like our own." This is the case—the whole case—so far as concerns the proof of the doctrine; it rests entirely upon analogy, and upon analogy having this extent. And in order to a just estimate of the question, it is necessary to inquire into the nature of analogical reasoning, and ascertain the value of analogy as a ground for belief.

Analogical reasoning is the method of deducing from the similarity of things in certain respects, the conclusion that they are similar in other respects. A great part of the progress of experimental philosophy has been attained by the aid of analogical reasoning, opening the way and prompting new researches and experiments. By inferring the probability of further uniformity from that which has been already settled, the direction is given to such inquiry as either establishes or disproves the assumed hypothesis. Newton gives to analogy a very important place among the laws of philosophizing. By the sober and patient use of analogical reasoning he was led to discoveries which completed the establishment of some of the most important parts of his system, as springing from the doctrine of gravitation. Indeed, the use of analogical reasoning is indispensable in inductive philosophy. But it requires to be always used with caution, and to be kept strictly within its proper province. The history of philosophy shows innumerable instances of the wildest errors, as well as of the sublimest discoveries

arising from its application. Philosophically, an analogical conclusion can never amount to more than a probability. It may warrant an hypothesis, or serve as the basis of a theory, but can never be the proper ground of belief until its hypothetical assumptions have been sustained by the results of observation. Its force in moral reasonings is in the removal of objections, of which we have an invaluable example in Bishop Butler's *Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion*. The force of a mere analogical deduction depends upon the number and the importance of the resemblances from which it is drawn. The mere number of resemblances is of but little moment, because universal variety is one of the first of nature's laws. It is necessary that the resemblances should be found in those particulars which relate to the subject of inquiry.

This is the province of analogical reasoning in philosophy. At the utmost it can raise a probability. In various degrees, it may lead to hypothesis or theory, and so may prompt and guide experiment and observation. A lover of truth will ever seek to employ it guardedly, and to keep it within due bounds. To give up the reins to its control is to soar away into the land of dreams and speculations, as unprofitable as boundless. The great difference between Newton and the philosophers who preceded him lay in the rigour with which he kept analogy and hypothesis subordinate to experiment and observation. In the application of analogical reasoning to the question whether the heavenly bodies are inhabited, we are to direct our attention not merely to the fact that those bodies have many resemblances to our earth, but also to the inquiry whether those resemblances are applicable to the particular conditions which constitute inhabitability. Are the heavenly bodies like the earth in those particulars by which the earth is fitted to be the abode of intelligent beings? It is by a faithful consideration of these points that we may form a reliable judgment of the value of the argument from analogy in this case.

We are told that "before the great truths of astronomy were discovered" this hypothesis was embraced, and "philosophers and poets descried in the celestial spheres the abodes of the blest." They doubtless supposed themselves to be reasoning from analogy of some kind; and it would be curious to analyze the groundwork of those brilliant conceptions. But the philosopher of the present day will see that all those analogies were utterly valueless as grounds of belief, or even of probability. So far as we know, the doctrine of a plurality of worlds, as now advanced, rests wholly upon the new analogy, drawn from the Newtonian astronomy. But the doctrine is the same with that of the ancient theorists; and the argument by

which it is supported is of the same nature as before—analogy. It is a new speculation in support of an old theory. The new analogy is certainly an advance upon the old. It rests upon a resemblance of the planets to the earth, in “form, and size, and motions.” It was upon this that Fontenelle relied, in his treatise published in the year 1686, the year before the publication of Newton’s *Principia*. “The earth is a planet which turns round its own axis, and also round the sun:” therefore, the moon and other planets are inhabited! Was there not a long step from the premises to the conclusion? Was not such an argument drawn out very thin—even in the condition of scientific knowledge in Newton’s day? These were the resemblances which were then known. And it is to be observed that they embraced about all that was then known in regard to most of the planets. And the argument from analogy might have been presented by a bold theorist in this imposing form—that as the planets in nearly all that we know of them, are like the earth, it is reasonable to conclude that they are like it in all other respects.

The sound and cautious philosopher, whose only aim was to learn what is true in the matter, would then have paused to consider how much this argument should be qualified by a reference to that other universal rule, which admits of no exception, that there is variety in all things; and it is, therefore, very supposable that planets might be made like the earth in these particulars, without being fitted for the abode of intelligent beings. Let us wait and see what light may be thrown upon the question by the future progress of scientific research.

It will be instructive to inquire what further light science has thrown upon the resemblances and differences between the earth and the other planets, as related to the question of inhabitability. Almost two hundred years have elapsed, during which astronomical observation has been pushed with great diligence. And now what do we find? One of the most learned philosophers of the age has undertaken to vindicate Fontenelle’s theory, without adducing a single new analogy from all the discoveries that have been made in all this time. Is this because the subsequent disclosures have only revealed differences? We find that, in the advance of astronomical research, the planets have been more accurately weighed and measured, their density of structure ascertained, and the light and heat they receive from the sun carefully calculated. The surface of the moon has been more accurately scanned by improved telescopes, and the external appearance of the planets watched to note their changes. And, in addition, it is found that there are thirty small planets, revolving like the earth, and two larger ones, outside of the planet

Jupiter, and therefore still further removed from the genial influences of the central sun. All these come within the scope of the original analogy, and evidently weaken its force by multiplying the original difficulties in the way of a conclusion. For the argument from analogy, in the form which astronomy presents, is of universal application. If it proves anything of the planets, it proves that all are inhabited, just as surely as it proves that any one of them is inhabited. And if the point is surrendered as to any, the analogy is broken as to all. We know that one planet, the earth, is inhabited; and the analogist therefore argues that all are so. But if we find reason to believe of one other that it is uninhabited because uninhabitable, then we establish a counter analogy which balances the first.

We shall not press the argument in regard to the planetoids, recently increased in number to thirty-five, although it fairly puzzles the philosophers; Dr. Lardner gives them up, and Sir David Brewster passes them by. But the moon has the greatest resemblance, in its conditions, to the earth. And the examinations which have been made by modern telescopes, show its surface to be all waste and barren; a vast field of dead volcanoes, covered only with lava and ashes; broken into chasms and precipices; a huge cinder or mass of slag, without any appearance of air or moisture, which are essential to the support of either animal or vegetable life.* Sir John Herschel says that "the climate of the moon must be very extraordinary; the alternations being that of unmitigated and burning sunshine, fiercer than an equatorial noon, continued for a whole fortnight; and the keenest severity of frost, far exceeding that of our polar winters, for an equal time." How dreary the idea of having rational creatures consigned to such a country! The eminent Dr. Lardner, who is vouched for by Sir David Brewster as "a mathematician and a natural philosopher, who has studied more than any preceding writer the analogies between the earth and the other planets," says, in a late publication, that

"The entire geographical character of the moon, thus ascertained by long-continued and exact telescopic surveys, leads to the conclusion that *no analogy exists* between it and the earth, which could confer any probability on the conjecture that it fulfils the same purposes in the economy of the universe; and we must infer that whatever be its uses in the solar system, or in the general purposes of creation, it is *not inhabited* by organized races, such as those to which the earth is appropriated."—*Museum of Science and Art*, vol. iii, p. 48.

◦ Sir David Brewster, indeed, brings some arguments to show there were volcanoes less than a century ago, and that there is an atmosphere to the moon, but only in the valleys, and not above fifteen hundred feet high.

Thus it appears that in the case of the planet which is nearest to the earth, and most like it in relation to the sun, the more we know of it the less we see of resemblance, until we learn at last that it is absolutely void of many conditions indispensable to life.* But the moon is but a secondary planet; perhaps the advance of astronomy has strengthened the analogy of the primary planets with the earth. Mercury, we are told, receives seven times as much light and heat as the earth; and has a solidity equal to gold, while the total mass of the earth is less dense than iron. Venus, as large and heavy as the earth, is only twice as bright and hot; shows no trace of air or water, or of an uneven surface; and may have cooled slowly into a smooth and glassy ball, which would account for its brilliant appearance. Mars is most like the earth in density, in the length of its days, and in having a change of seasons; it is thought by astronomers to have seas of water; but the existence of an atmosphere is less certain; while it has less than half the light and heat of the earth, and gravity at the surface is only half what it is here. Certainly these are important differences, but they are not conclusive with respect to Mars. *If it has an atmosphere, it is astronomically capable of sustaining inhabitants, notwithstanding these differences.*

But the differences are much greater in the case of the superior planets. Dr. Lardner says that "the density of Jupiter very little exceeds that of water; that of Uranus and Neptune is exactly that of water; while Saturn is so light that it would float in water like a globe of pine wood."

"The seas and oceans of these planets must consist of a liquid far lighter than water. It is computed that a liquid on Jupiter which would be analogous to the terrestrial oceans, would be three times lighter than sulphuric ether, the lightest known liquid; and would be such that cork would scarcely float in it!"—*Museum of Science and Art*, vol. i, p. 35.

The flattened form of Jupiter is said to prove that it is but a fluid mass, of nearly uniform consistency. Its share of sun-light and heat is twenty-five times less than ours from its distance, and must be further diminished by the perpetual clouds that surround it, although in respect of light it is favoured with constant moonshine from its satellites. Its diurnal revolution is made in ten hours, which in so huge a body must cause an amazing swiftness of motion on its surface; and the force of gravity is said to be two and a half times greater than it is on the surface of the earth. These are important differences, when the subject of our inquiry respects the adaptation of the planet to the support of life; for it must be conceded, that if we reason by analogy to prove the existence of life there, and if the laws of attraction and of light are seen to be the same

there as here, we are bound by the same analogy to conclude that the laws of life are the same there as here.

The case of Saturn is still stronger, for its light and heat are only one-ninetieth of those of the earth, while Uranus has only one three-hundred-and-sixtieth, and Neptune but one nine-hundredth. The sun itself, seen from them, would appear only as a star, and life must be impossible—according to any laws of life with which we are acquainted.

Such is the bearing of the discoveries which have been made by astronomy since Fontenelle published his speculations in 1686. They certainly increase the number and importance of the differences, and therefore proportionably weaken the force of the analogical argument from the resemblances as they then appeared. Nor does it answer any rational purpose here to make gratuitous suppositions in regard to the possibility of creating races of creatures who could live in those spheres. There is no argument in mere conjecture. We are now examining analogies to see how far they prove a fact—not framing hypotheses to guide an experiment.

But it is not alone in astronomy that science has made advances in regard to subjects bearing on this inquiry. Geology, chemistry, and physiology, all have made great progress, and shed a flood of light upon the requisites to inhabitability, and the process by which a planet is made inhabitable. The view which we are now about to present is different, we believe, from anything that has appeared in other treatises. It is quite evident that no great amount of help can be gained toward the settlement of this question, by tossing back and forth alleged astronomical facts or conjectures that are so far doubtful or visionary, that two such philosophers as the authors before us are disagreed as to their truth or bearing. The hypothesis that the planets are inhabited is to be proved or rendered probable, if at all, not by imagining what may be, but by showing what is, in reference to their known conditions and indications. And in an argument resting solely on analogy, or the resemblance of the planets to the earth, importance is to be attached chiefly to the resemblances or differences in those points which are found to be essential requisites to inhabitability. We have a certain number of round balls of matter of vast size, all of which have regular rotary motions on their axes, and all regularly revolve around the sun. We wish to know whether they are all inhabitable. And although our means of knowledge in regard to the others are very limited, very fortunately we now know, in full detail, the means and processes by which one of them was taken from its original crude state, and by a series of transmutations at length brought into the condition of inhabitability.

Science has traced the whole process, with great particularity, by investigations and discoveries almost entirely accomplished since the days of Newton and Huygens, and, indeed, chiefly since the days of the elder Herschel. In fact, the question of inhabitability, as resting upon analogy, comes up at this time in a form radically different from its aspect in any former period.

The modern science of geology enables us to contemplate the earth in its primitive condition when it was probably a rotating mass of melted mineral substances, mixed together without any form or order beyond that impressed by gravitation and motion. Such a globe possessed all those grand astronomical conditions of form, and size, and motions, which have been relied on to prove that other planets were inhabitable. But we now know that such a globe was not capable of sustaining inhabitants at all,—not even of containing the very lowest forms of animal life, or of vegetable organization, and hardly even of crystallization. At length the external surface, composed of the lighter substances, cooled into a crust of granite, about twenty thousand feet thick. The abrasion of this by water, aided by heat and many chemical forces, produced the pulverized materials which were deposited in layers, and transformed into stratified rocks, of different characters, succeeding each other in a regular order. By examining these successive strata, we find that at one stage the earth became capable of sustaining animal and vegetable life of the lowest possible forms, the most imperfectly formed invertebrata, and the crudest algae and mosses. Another layer presents us with fishes, and also with a reedy vegetation. Then we have in strata still higher the life of birds and reptiles, and the vegetation of ferns and pines. Above this we find the animal life of mammals and the vegetation of trees with covered fruit. And it is a curious fact, that the most perfect forms, both of animal and vegetable life, found no place on the earth until the process of preparation was nearly completed, and the globe had become inhabitable.*

* The following curious paragraphs are from the pen of Hugh Miller, the great Scotch geologist. In a recent essay, after observing that the *rosaceæ*, or rose order of plants, are the most perfect in their organization, he says:—"The *rosaceæ* includes among flowers the lovely family of the roses, in all their species and varieties; and among fruits, the apple, the pear, the quince, the medlar, the cherry, the apricot, the strawberry, the raspberry, and many others, from the luscious plum and nectarine, to the rowan and the sloe; and of the recognized representative of the order—the apple—Oken curiously remarks, that 'apples are, without doubt, the most perfect fruits.' 'The apple,' he says, 'consists of all the parts of the blossom—seed, capsule, and fleshy calyx. Its edible substance or flesh is not simply a sweetmeat, but a true aliment, which admits of being eaten after it has been kept fresh for a year—of being dried, exported, or

We shall not dwell in detail upon the vast periods of duration employed in accomplishing these several stages. It is idle to set the imagination at work, devising suppositions to the contrary of this. The proofs are ample and complete, that all the general laws by which matter is now governed were in force during the geologic periods. Chemistry, gravitation, attraction, growth and decay, all have left, throughout those periods, the most unmistakable traces of their regular action according to the same laws which govern them now.* And it is equally evident that life, in all its successive

cooked as a kitchen vegetable; in cases of exigency, too, it occurs in such abundance that the whole human race might live upon it,—which cannot be said of any other fruit.' Now, it is surely a curious fact, that these rosaceæ—at once so pleasing as flowers to the human eye, and so gratifying as fruits to the human palate—are among the most modern of plants. They have no place in geology. Agassiz holds that they can be scarce more ancient than man himself. They were, it is not improbable, plants of that garden specially planted for Adam by the Creator to keep and to dress." "Nearly the same remark applies to Buffon's two classes of animals. The ox, the ass, the horse, and the goat, all preceded man; but they did so only during a comparatively brief period, (brief geologically,) for none of them seem to ascend so far into the past as the times of the Red Crag—a deposit, seventy per cent. of whose shells still continues to exist; and the sheep seems to have been introduced into creation at so nearly the same time as its owner and master, that its bones, like his own, have not been found in a decidedly fossil state. Is there no such evidence of design as a Paley would have delighted to contemplate in arrangements such as these? The man whose first assigned work upon earth was to keep and dress a garden, and of whose two first-born sons the one became an agriculturist and the other a rearer of flocks and herds, was preceded, and but just preceded, by the improvable plants of the garden and field that spring for his benefit, and by the tameable animals—the ox, the horse, the goat, and the sheep. What could he have done as a gardener during the age of the club-mosses and the ferns, or as a farmer or breeder of flocks and herds during the reign of the coniferous trees and the reptiles?"

° The evidence that life—animal and vegetable—existed on the further side of the tertiary geologic periods under the same laws as now, is as conclusive as that it exists under the same laws on the further side of the Atlantic. And these laws cast much light on the rate at which many of the mechanical deposits must have gone on. The lias of Eathie, for instance, consists, for about four hundred feet in vertical extent, of an almost impalpable shale, divided into layers scarce thicker than pasteboard. It might well be predicated, from the merely-mechanical character of the deposit, that its formation could not have been rapid; but how greatly is the argument for the lapse of a vast period of time for its growth strengthened by the fact that each one of these many thousand layers formed a crowded platform of animal life, and that so thickly are they covered with the remains of not only free shells, such as ammonites, but also of sedentary shells, such as ostrea, that the organisms of but two of the more crowded platforms could not find room on a single one. And these shells were the contemporaries of slow-growing pines, that on the average increased in diameter little more than the fifth of an inch yearly." "In the Mid-Lothian basin there are thirty seams of workable coal intercalated among deposits of various character, whose

gradations, took place as early as the earth became fitted for its sustenance, leading to the just conclusion that the earth was inhabited just as soon as it was inhabitable.

But this gives us only a very superficial and inadequate view of the wonderful process to which the earth was subjected before it could be regarded as inhabitable. By the aid of mineralogy and chemistry we learn many more things concerning it, which render it vastly more complicated and wonderful. We find that at a certain high temperature a melted mass of rock under a heavy pressure of water will cool into a semi-crystalline form like granite. Then an incumbeant ocean, and an atmosphere perhaps heavily charged with gaseous matters, would, while heated, abrade and dissolve the chief materials of the crust, and deposit the same in layers, which might be subjected to a degree of heat sufficient to give the actual form to the primitive stratified rocks. The heated water would dissolve the silicious matters. After that, the cooled waters would dissolve the lime that forms the primitive limestone rocks. Then other changes occur of mineralogical character, or of chemical composition, imply-

united thickness amounts to nearly three thousand feet; and undermost of these seams the original soil may still be detected on which the plants that formed their coal flourished and decayed. Whole beds of the mountain limestone are composed almost exclusively of marine shells and the stems of lily encrinites. In the old red sandstone there are three different formations abounding in fishes—and yet, so far as is yet known, there is not a single species of fish common to any two of them. And who shall tell us that the life-term of a *creation* is a brief period? In the upper silurian system we have examined a deposit more than fifty feet thick, every fragment of which had once been united to animal life, crustaceous, molluscan, or radiated. And how wonderfully, too, the further geologists explore, and the more carefully they examine, are their formations found to expand! Phillips estimated the thickness of the coal measures at ten thousand feet. Sir Charles Lyell, in one of his recent visits to America, found that the coal measures of Nova Scotia had a thickness of more than *fourteen* thousand six hundred feet. Phillips estimated all the deposits beneath the old red sandstone at twenty thousand feet. The geologists of the government survey find that the silurians alone amount to about *thirty* thousand feet; and under these, in Scotland at least, lie the clay slates, the mica schists, and the enormous deposits of the gneisses. On the continent the remains of whole creations have been found intercalated between what had been deemed contiguous systems. An entire system—the permian—has been detected between the coal measures and the trias; and that shell deposit that extends between the Gironde and the Pyrenees, once regarded as of the same age with the coralline crag, has yielded seven hundred species of shells—nearly twice the number of all the species found on the coasts of Britain—that belong neither to the crag nor to the older eocene. It is yet another creation that has appeared, for which fitting space must be found in the record. The more thoroughly the field-geologist examines, the larger become his demands on the eternity of the past, for periods which it is certainly very competent to supply.”—*Hugh Miller.*

ing the action of water, of the atmosphere, and of intense heat. Chemical elements are absorbed from the water, others are abstracted from the air, new systems of rocks are precipitated and consolidated, and again broken and abraded, comminuted and mingled together, until at length a surface and a temperature are produced which admit of the lowest forms of vegetable and animal life. These collect and combine new chemical elements, which by the decay of the animal and vegetable species, become available for new forms of rocks. This process is repeated many times; the results showing that at each successive stage, either such new and useful materials have been gathered, or such deleterious elements have been abstracted from earth, air, and water, as to admit of more and more perfect development of animal and vegetable natures. At one stage we find the marks to indicate the prevalence of vegetation almost exclusively, and this of so huge a growth as to furnish the material for all the coal formations in the world. How vast the quantity of carbon that existed in other forms, prior to its consolidation into the beds of coal! After this we find traces of animal life of huge dimensions; lizards eighty feet long, and birds thirty feet high; but all still belonging to the less perfect and complicated species, showing that the earth was not finished, and that the air and water were still overcharged with grosser elements. The vast quantities of lime in various forms, the many other mineral substances diffused through the upper secondary, and the tertiary rocks, may illustrate the many chemical processes for which the earth is indebted to animal and vegetable life, before it was reduced to a habitable state. It is to be borne in mind that every rock, every mineral, every pebble and grain of sand has a chemical history, as well as a mineralogical history; and that every one of its elements has been eliminated in some way out of the air or water, or out of the materials of that molten mass which forms the internal substance of the globe. Also, that each separate species, both of animals and vegetables, has some peculiarity in its chemical composition or product, and, therefore, serves some distinct and separate purpose in the wonderful work.

It is to processes like these that we are indebted for all the mineral and metallic riches of the earth—for that countless variety of substances which aid in manufactures, fill the shelves of the apothecary, and which enable us to furnish our tables, build our houses, and navigate our ships. And all these are found to be abundant and widely diffused, in proportion to their indispensableness for human welfare. We find them so posited and arranged as to afford a great motive to industry and to study, a spring to invention, objects for commerce, and a bond of unity for nations. Deprived of them all, the

world would be uninhabitable—deprived of any one of them, it would be less fitted than it is to be the abode of intelligent beings.

It would extend this paper too much to illustrate all these points in detail. But it would be easy to show that the perfection of these innumerable processes required the existence of many conditional circumstances. It required a globe of a certain size to give the right degree of pressure to the incumbent fluid while the primitive crust was cooling. It required a molten mass within, so great as to keep alive the inward fire through all the duration allotted to the globe itself. It required a certain distance from the sun, so as to secure an equable and sufficient surface heat, and yet not too great for the highest development of life.

It required, also, a proper length of the day and of the year; the influences of the moon to produce tides; water that could be made pure by mere evaporation; an atmosphere of proper density to support the water in clouds; electricity sufficient to break the clouds and precipitate the water again to the earth, and yet not too much to permit life. It required that there should be such atmospheric changes as would disintegrate rocks, favour vegetation, and keep the air itself in a state of self-purification. Failing any one of these requisites, it is impossible to prove that the earth could ever have been reduced to a state of habitability by any process of natural causes. And it would be easy to demonstrate that, without the presence of the greater part of the actual conditions of the earth, it would not have been inhabitable at all. For it is ever to be kept in view that the same rules of analogical reasoning which have raised the main question before us, establish for us the meaning of inhabitability, and limit our speculations to the laws of life of the material universe as we find them upon the earth.

There is a consideration to be brought in here, which is derived from the science of agriculture. Pulverized rock is not soil. It requires the process of animal and vegetable life to produce soil; and it is found that, in a general way, soil is productive in proportion to the number and variety of animal and vegetable processes through which it has passed. Everywhere mosses and minute animals are at work, then trees and animals and birds, absorbing chemical substances from the air, and depositing them in the earth; or feeding upon the solid ingredients of earth or rock, and giving them back in new chemical combinations. It is only through the infinite number and variety of these agencies that all the processes of nature's chemistry are carried on, so as to make the earth properly inhabitable. And it was not until the completion of this lengthened chain of changes, that the earth was found capable of sustaining such

animal organizations as were suitable to be endowed with rational capacities and moral obligations. It were unworthy of the dignity of reason, to be bestowed upon saurian monsters or more primeval oysters and star-fish. It were equally unsuitable that the reasoning creature whose existence crowns and finishes creation's work should be introduced into a world which was not already occupied with the most perfect animal and vegetable natures, both for delight and use. And how impracticable were the labour of our life, if we had nothing to commence upon but cold rock-dust, and nothing to subsist upon but the primeval mosses and animated mites of the paleozoic period; with no wheat, no apples, no roses, and no perfected soil on which they could grow; with no ox, or sheep, or horse, and no vegetation on which they could subsist. It is a curious fact, worthy of being noted here, that gold, the perfect metal, appears to have been injected into the rocks from which it has been abraded into the loose earth, at a period later than the formation of the tertiary rocks, as no traces of it are found in them, and it enters into no chemical combination, being made for man alone.

With the knowledge that we now have of the various particulars which go to make a planet habitable, and of the immensely complicated and prolonged process by which a planet is brought into the required condition for the occupancy of inhabitants, we must again examine the force of the analogical reasoning which would prove that the other planets are inhabited. In how many of these respects do they resemble the earth, and in how many particulars do they differ; and what is the relative value or importance of the things in which they agree, and the things in which they differ?

We find the moon so small that it is cooled to a slag; that its inward fires produced a succession of terrific volcanoes, until its water and air were exhausted, and its fires went out. We find Venus and Mercury, the one receiving twice and the other seven times as much light and heat from the sun as this earth, and of much greater density; and Venus is apparently a perfectly smooth globe that has never possessed such an excess of internal heat as to agitate its outward surface. It would be difficult to believe that it has ever undergone so great a change on the surface as is involved in the first formation of stratified rock. Mars is more like the earth in its motions and periods, and is believed by many to be supplied both with water and air, though many have doubts as to the latter. But its force of gravity is so small, from its diminished size, and its heat from the sun is so greatly reduced by distance, that a large part of the complicated process we have described is impossible. Then Jupiter, with its huge bulk of the consistence of water, and

Saturn much lighter, and Uranus and Neptune so far from the sun that it could only be seen from them as a star—the process of preparation for the support of inhabitants could never begin in either of those planets. There is not one particular among all the discoveries of modern science that tends to strengthen the analogy between the earth and the other planets, beyond the force it had when the discovery was first made that they were all alike in form and motion. But on the contrary, the progress of knowledge has absolutely disproved the only theorem which could ever have been formed on the subject. We cannot say now that a revolving sphere is of course to be presumed inhabited, because we know that the earth was a revolving sphere for countless ages when it was not inhabited. And we know also that it required a complicated process of preparation before it was inhabitable, and that a large part of these preparatory processes are impossible with respect to most of the other planets.*

In the pursuit after truth, the argument from analogy is bound to submit to a more rigid scrutiny, when it stands alone as the sole proof on which our belief is claimed, than in those cases where it comes in aid of a belief founded on other and more positive evidence; or where, as in Butler's Analogy, it is employed mainly to remove objections and solve difficulties in regard to our belief. We have not a scintilla of evidence, from science or revelation, to prove that the planets are inhabited, except the argument from analogy. There is not a fact in nature or in religion, that has obtained the general belief of mankind on analogies so slight as we have found, and in the face of counter-analogies so numerous and overwhelming.

In our examination of this argument from analogy, it is irrelevant to take into consideration the various suppositions of what *may be*. When a matter is proved to be true, we may indulge to an extent in suppositions of what *may be* in consequence. But our first inquiry respects *what is*, and not what *may be*. And until we find substantial proof, or highly-probable analogy, to warrant a belief that the planets are inhabited, it is unphilosophical to indulge in groundless conjectures as to what sort of beings those inhabitants may be. All the analogy we have in the case compels us to suppose that if the planets are inhabited the bodily organs of the inhabitants must so far resemble ours as to be the inlets both of pleasure and pain, of

* The meteoric stones are unquestionably planetary matter. They are found to contain no new chemical element, and no new mineralogical type; and they are subject to all the laws of matter like the materials of our earth. But of sixty chemical elements, they present only eighteen, thus lacking thirty per cent. of the number of primary substances which go to fit the earth for the abode of man.

health and disease, of the means of prolonging life and the causes of producing death, of temptations to evil and of retributive consequences following the wrong. The law of compensations must prevail there as here. If organs are constructed differently from ours, they will not answer all the purposes of ours. If senses are more acute, they must cause temptation to be more active, and suffering more severe, and retribution more terrible.

It is not to the purpose to suggest that the planets may be undergoing a preparatory process to be inhabited hereafter. The question is of the grounds for believing that they are now inhabited. We will not recapitulate the reasons which exist for believing that they are not capable of undergoing those changes, under the laws of nature through which the earth has been fitted to be inhabited. They do not possess that exact adjustment of internal and solar heat, of gravity and motion, of light and electricity, that due proportion of solid and fluid and aerial matter, that exact adjustment of oxygen to the quantity of carbon and of the metallic bases, which are requisite to the success of this preparatory course. Nor is it to the purpose to suggest that they may be looked to as some of the "many mansions" that are to be the abode of glorified human beings after the resurrection. For we know that a still more absolute metamorphosis is to take place before that event;—the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. And the inhabitants will then have bodies which are no longer subject to decay, organs which are never to become the inlets of temptation or pain, and powers which know no fatigue or dissolution. And they will require abodes which will have no need of sun or moon, and into which there shall nothing enter that defileth, or worketh abomination, or maketh a lie. These laws of gravity and friction, of heat and light, of hydrostatics and pneumatics, of crystallization and chemical affinity, of animal and vegetable life, of succession and decay, are but feeble forces toward a transformation so complete, and so manifestly demanding the interposition of the same creative Omnipotence which formed the present world under its present laws.

As a question of science, then, the doctrine of a plurality of worlds is placed too low on the scale of probability to occupy the serious attention of the philosopher. The only interest it possesses is inspired by a materialized imagination, like that which peoples the woods with sprites, and the fields with fairies. Hard as it is to prove a negative, especially in a case where there is so little knowledge on a subject as to furnish nothing in proof of the affirmative, it must be admitted that we have here as much evidence to prove the

negative, as the nature of the case admits. And we may safely offer the prediction that, hereafter, no philosopher, in the true pursuit of scientific truth, will ever undertake a series of observations, or go through a course of calculations, with the object of proving that the planets are inhabited.

We have not yet considered the *a priori* argument, which seems to have impressed many with its force, drawn from what is supposed to be due to the character of the Creator. Dr. Chalmers, in his *Astronomical Discourses*, states it thus:—"What reason have we to think that those mightier globes, which roll in other parts of creation, and which we have discovered to be worlds in magnitude, are not also *worlds in use and dignity*? Why should we think that the great Architect of nature, supreme in wisdom as he is in power, would call those stately mansions into existence, *and leave them unoccupied*?" The celebrated Dr. Bentley, in his sermon on the "*Origin and Frame of the World*," asks: "Would it not raise in us a *higher apprehension of the infinite majesty and boundless beneficence of God*, to suppose that those remote and vast bodies were formed not merely upon our account, to be guessed at through an optic glass, but for different ends *and nobler purposes*?" But Sir David Brewster has more fully developed this form of the argument in his late publication, "*More Worlds than One*." We shall present it most fairly and fully by the quotation of several separate paragraphs:—

"If the Almighty has occupied a million of years in preparing the most of the earth as a suitable residence for man, by the slow operation of secondary causes, and has deposited the remains of vegetable and animal life in each series of its formation, in order to enable man to read the history of his omnipotence and wisdom, is that any reason why the earth, the residence of man, should, among countless and more glorious worlds than his own, be the only one that is inhabited? Reason and common sense dictate a very different opinion."—P. 214, New-York edition.

"Considering the solar system as stationary in space, and unconnected with any other system, the argument for the existence of inhabitants on its planets has a certain fixed value, compounded of the argument from analogy, and the degree of *absurdity which attaches to the idea of the planets being lumps of moving matter, shone upon and shining in vain*. But when we have proved that the solar system is revolving round some distant centre, in an orbit of such inconceivable dimensions, that millions of years might be required to perform one single round; when we consider that this distant centre must be a sun, with attending planets like our own, revolving in like manner round our sun, or round the common centre of gravity, the mind *rejects almost with indignation the ignoble sentiment*, that man is the only being that performs this immeasurable journey; that Jupiter and Saturn, and Uranus and Neptune, with their bright array of regal train-bearers, are but colossal blocks of lifeless clay, encumbering the earth as a drag, and *mocking the creative majesty of heaven*.

"It is hardly necessary to illustrate these views by more familiar similitudes. The Architect of a solar system, stationary in space, and with but one

of its smallest planets inhabited, may in some degree be likened to a sovereign who, in sending a military colony to cultivate and defend an island in the Pacific, engaged twenty-five soldiers, *one of whom was a light-infantry man, who did all the honours and duties of the island, while the other twenty-four were tall and powerful grenadiers, who enjoyed themselves day and night upon merry-go-rounds, heated by genial fires, and lighted by brilliant chandeliers of gas, but performing no useful work, and doing no honour to their king.* The Creator of the same solar system launched into an orbit of immeasurable extent, and wheeling through ether with the velocity of fifty-seven miles in a second, may have some resemblance to a mighty autocrat, who should establish a railway round the coasts of Europe and Africa, and place upon it an enormous train of first-class carriages, impelled year after year by tremendous steam power, while there was but a *philosopher and a culprit in an humble van, attended by hundreds of unoccupied carriages and empty trucks.*"—Pp. 128-130.

"Those *ungenial minds that can be brought to believe that the earth is the only inhabited body in the universe, will have no difficulty in conceiving that it, also, might have been without inhabitants.* Nay, if such minds are imbued with geological truth, they must admit that for millions of years *the earth was without inhabitants*; and hence we are led to the extraordinary result that for millions of years there was not an intelligent creature in the vast dominions of the universal King; and that before the formation of the protozoic strata, there was neither a planet nor an animal throughout the infinity of space! During this long period of universal death, when nature herself was asleep, the sun with his magnificent attendants, the planets with their faithful satellites, the stars in the binary systems, the solar system itself, were performing their daily, their annual, their secular movements, unseen, unheeded, and *fulfilling no purpose that human reason can conceive*—lamps lighting nothing—fires heating nothing—waters quenching nothing—clouds screening nothing—breezes fanning nothing—and everything around, mountain and valley, hill and dale, earth and ocean, *meaning nothing.*

"The stars
Did wander darkling in the eternal space."

"To our apprehension, such a condition of the earth, of the solar system, of the sidereal universe, would be the same as that of our own globe, if all its vessels of war and of commerce were traversing its seas with empty cabins and freightless holds; as if all the railways on its surface were in full activity, without passengers and goods; and all our machinery beating the air and gnashing their teeth without work performed. A house without tenants, a city without citizens, presents to our minds *the same idea as a planet without life, and a universe without inhabitants.* Why the house was built, why the city was founded, *why the planet was made, and why the universe was created, it would be difficult even to conjecture.* Equally great would be the difficulty were the planets shapeless lumps of matter poised in ether, and motionless as the grave; but when we consider them as chiselled spheres teeming with inorganic beauty, and in full mechanical activity; performing their appointed motions with such universal precision that their days and their years never err a second of time in hundreds of centuries, the *difficulty of believing them without life is, if possible, immeasurably increased.* To conceive any one material globe, whether a gigantic clod slumbering in space, or a noble planet equipped like our own, and duly performing its appointed task, *to have no living occupants, or not in a state of preparation to receive them, seems to us one of those notions which could be harboured only in an ill-educated and ill-regulated mind,—a mind without faith and without hope.* But *to conceive a whole universe of moving and revolving worlds in such a category, indicates, in our apprehension, a mind dead to feeling and shorn of reason!*"—Pp. 186-189.

"Is it possible to believe that, with the exception of our little planet, all the other planets of the system, all the hundreds of comets, all the systems of the universe, are to *our reason made in vain*?"—P. 191.

"It is just possible that these walls may never have been a protection to inhabitants, nor these churches thronged, nor these houses occupied; but if this were the case, the sovereign who founded the city, who encircled it with a wall, who erected the churches, and who built the houses, *must have been a fool or a madman*."—P. 197.

Most certainly, no one will think of charging this learned Scotchman with intentional irreverence toward his Maker. But these paragraphs strike us as the boldest attempt to scan the undisclosed counsels and purposes of the Most High that we have ever met with, unless in the ravings of professed blasphemers. The old question rises before us, "Shall the thing formed say of him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" And we hear a voice saying, "As the heavens are above the earth, so are my ways above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts." And we exclaim with the sacred poet, "Who by searching can find out God, and who can understand the Almighty to perfection? It is high as heaven, what canst thou know? deeper than hell, what canst thou do?" And we ask ourselves, Is reason competent to determine questions on which nature furnishes so very insufficient data, and concerning which revelation is silent? And is it necessary that we should attempt to solve problems so high and far-reaching, when neither the facts nor their knowledge can affect our happiness or our duty; and neither science nor religion has furnished the first particle of proof on which to rest our belief?

The argument would seem to assume that the planets themselves are degraded and injured, unless they are permitted to enjoy the presence and serve the purposes of inhabitants, and would, therefore, have a right to complain. It assumes that man is competent to judge and say, that planets left destitute of inhabitants are made in vain. It assumes it as an axiom, that planets are for inhabitants, just as houses are for people, and just as ships are for passengers; when all that we know of the matter is that *one* planet is inhabited. It dares to say to the Creator, that *if he has* created these bodies, and left them without inhabitants, he has committed a palpable absurdity, has been governed by "notions which could be harboured only in an ill-educated and ill-regulated mind;" and has pursued a policy, which, if pursued by a human sovereign, would prove that he "must have been a fool or a madman." Yet no man can deny that it is possible to suppose such improvements hereafter in our telescopes, or other means of acquiring a knowledge of the heavenly bodies, as shall afford us actual demonstration of the facts, that the planets are not inhabited, and are not capable from their

structure of being fitted for the support of inhabitants. And then how shocking will these vain-glorious assumptions appear!

The truth is, we have no competency whatever to determine, *a priori*, what is wise or fitting for the Creator to do in the creation of the world. We know but little of his works, and vastly less of his reasons, and still infinitely less of his comprehensive designs. Where we find that a thing is made fit for a certain purpose, we infer that such purpose was at least a part of the reason why it was created thus. But we are not competent to infer that, because one of a class of things possesses certain qualities or capabilities, therefore all of that class possesses the same in all respects. We know that universal diversity is the most wide-spread law of creation, for in fact no two things are made precisely alike. We know that things nearly related are often widely opposite in effect, as the same species of plants includes the potato and the deadly night-shade. We know that God has reserved to himself the unchallenged prerogative of acting on the dictates of his own wisdom, and, of the same lump of clay, of making "one vessel unto honour, and another to dishonour;" and that every created thing is right and honourable when it answers the end for which he made it. We know that the planets and other heavenly bodies subserve many objects for the benefit of mankind, and it is not competent for us to decide that these objects alone are not ample reasons to justify their creation. We know that the production of these systems, or of innumerable others supposable, was a work of infinite ease to Him who "spake, and it was done—commanded, and it stood fast." We know that the planets are useful to the earth as the abode of man, by constituting a part of the solar system, and contributing by their gravity and motion to the regularity of the whole. In many other ways they are serviceable, as in determining latitude and longitude, and other astronomical problems. Their light and beauty contribute largely to the pleasantness of man's earthly abode. Perhaps no science has contributed so much to the enlargement and cultivation of the intellect as astronomy. The moral and religious influence of the heavenly bodies, in leading the thoughts of men up to the great Creator, is incalculably great, and apparently essential to the preservation of piety on earth. We know the value which God has put upon the earth as the abode of man, by the fact that he has given his only-begotten Son to die upon the earth for the redemption of sinners among men. And having for this end actually made the only sacrifice which God can make, it is a small thing to believe that he might create any number of these planets and stars with no higher end in view than to aid in rendering the earth a fit theatre for the work of redemption. In

view of all this, it is evident that our *a priori* conclusions as to what "must be" the use or end of creating planets are not of the weight of a straw. Nay, more, it is criminal presumption in us to form such conclusions at all, with any degree of confidence that is likely to affect our estimate of the character and government of God; for secret things belong to him alone. But on the other hand, it seems plain to our view, that the whole affluence of the material universe, if appropriated to man and his redemption, is strictly in keeping with all that he has revealed, whether in his word or his works, concerning the scope of his designs. For he that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?

Here is the true analogy that must control the belief, and ought to satisfy the desires of the Christian—the analogy of faith. If God has created all things by his Son, and if he has given all things to him, and made him the Judge and Lord of all, on account of his work of redemption, then we have in this a fixed rule, and may here find a dominant analogy, by which, all other reasonings and analogies failing, we may come to a firm and definite conclusion, even on a question so difficult as this. It is impossible to make any theory of a plurality of worlds square with the scheme of redemption.

God's moral kingdom, to which the scheme of redemption pertains, is, like his natural kingdom, governed by established laws. It has its fixed principles, as the other has its natural laws. It is based upon the fundamental idea of accountability and retribution. The kingdom of heaven requires for its consummation an innumerable company of holy beings, recovered from a state of sin, and restored to the divine favor through a Redeemer. The complex being, man, made a little lower than the angels in his immortal capacity, and yet affiliated with the brutes in his material nature, is constituted the subject of this grand development. The whole visible world is inferior and subsidiary to this, and only made for it, as means to an end; and so inferior in value, that a man would be the loser to gain the whole of it, and lose his own soul. There is but one Creator, and he has made but one creation. Unity characterizes his work as it does his being. He has one only-begotten Son, and him he has incorporated with this one procedure, as he can be with no other. There is but one redemption, as there is only one Redeemer. Out of these beings, so strangely combining the spiritual with the animal, he is to constitute the kingdom of heaven; and there will be but one kingdom under one King. The bare statement of these great truths is sufficient to secure the assent of the great body of Christian people; and a little reflection must satisfy them

that they are conclusive against the belief in a plurality of worlds. If the supposed inhabitants of those worlds are sinners, which is the only law of life for material beings that we are acquainted with, then they have no redemption. If they are not sinners, then it is practicable to govern material beings without sin; and, therefore, man was not made and treated as he might have been, and has a ground of complaint, that he alone was suffered to fall. If the inhabitants of these bodies are like to human beings, as sensuous and suffering, and without hope, their existence can hardly be thought either pleasing or creditable to a God of infinite benevolence. If they are more elevated, more intellectual, more spiritual, they require a different scene of trial as the test of their virtue. If they are less conscientious and more animalized, and therefore more degraded and less reclaimable, the difficulties are still greater. Whatever way we turn, then, with Christianity in mind, we are met by insurmountable objections to the theory, which can be consistently held only by taking leave of the Bible, and placing ourselves under the guidance of that materialized imagination which unbelievers have called the light of nature.

ART. III.—LIFE AND WRITINGS OF DR. JOHN PYE SMITH.

1. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Pye Smith, D. D., LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S.* By JOHN MEDWAY. London: Jackson & Walford. 1853. Imperial 8vo., pp. 647.
2. *First Lines of Christian Theology, in the Form of a Syllabus, prepared for the Use of the Students in the Old College, Homerton. With subsequent Additions and Elucidations.* By JOHN PYE SMITH, D. D., LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S. Edited by WILLIAM FARRER, LL. B. London: Jackson & Walford. 1854. Imperial 8vo., pp. 744.

THE reputation of John Pye Smith was not confined to Britain or to Europe. His most important works are almost as well known on this side of the Atlantic as on the other; and indeed, America was forward in acknowledging his merit when he was yet comparatively little known in Britain. His first publication of importance was the *Letters to Belsham*, the first edition of which bore the date 1804, and the second 1805. This work procured for him his diploma of D. D. from Yale College, New-Haven, under date September 10, 1807, when he was only thirty-three years of age: so that America may well claim a peculiar interest in his life and labours.

John Pye Smith was a Yorkshireman, and his ancestors, so far as they can be traced upward, had been, on both sides, Yorkshire people. A great-uncle, John Pye, after whom he was named, had been from 1745 to 1773 pastor of a Congregational Church in the town of Sheffield. In this town John Pye Smith was born, May 25, 1774. Mrs. Pye survived her husband many years, took a deep interest in the welfare of her great-nephew, and seems to have had considerable influence in forming his character.

The father of Pye Smith, for many years before his death, conducted the business of bookseller in the town of Sheffield. Sheffield has never been a place distinguished for literary culture, and eighty years ago, though it had long been noted for its manufactures of cutlery of several kinds, it was comparatively a small town, containing probably not more than thirty thousand inhabitants. Accordingly we are not surprised to be informed that Mr. Smith's "was almost the only shop in Sheffield worth visiting for classical authors, Latin or Greek divinity, and good old English writers, especially of the age of the Puritans and Nonconformists, of whom and their works he had an extensive knowledge, of which he was very communicative, especially to ministers." Pye Smith's parents, we should add, were Nonconformists of the Congregationalist school, as his ancestors for several generations seem to have been.

His father's shop served John Pye both for "High School" and "University." The only instruction he ever received in classical learning seems to have been privately afforded, in the way of friendship, for a very inadequate period, and in desultory lessons, by the Rev. Jehoiada Brewer, his father's pastor and intimate acquaintance. "Books, and not living teachers, were his early, as they continued to be throughout life his prime, and almost his sole guides in the acquisition of knowledge."

In April, 1790, at the age of nearly sixteen, Pye Smith was bound for five years apprentice to his father; the indenture mentioning the three branches of bookseller, bookbinder and stationer. The shop was now become at once his school and his home. Of the books, he might have said that he was "*totus in illis*." He was very valuable to his father, and continued to become more so from his knowledge of books of every kind. His father, too, felt, no doubt, a natural pride in the attainments of his son, and looked forward with hope and pleasure to the prospect of his being permanently associated with himself. A few months before the time when his apprenticeship commenced, it would appear from an extant letter from his father to a friend, that an important change had taken place in the conduct of young Smith, of which the father speaks, at the date of

the letter, written three months after the apprenticeship, in terms of gratitude and hope. Up to this period his character had been independent and decided, and his disposition sanguine; but these elements, unsanctified by grace, must have been to his godly parents the cause of much uneasy apprehension. From this time, however, a change was observable, which, while it left these elements of character still in full force, so sanctified them and brought them under the control of Christian meekness and humility, as to render them only subsidiary to the unfettered development of that manly and conscientious piety which characterized his after years. This, of course, was the turning point of Pye Smith's history. We know from his own statement, that his position as apprentice and assistant in his father's business brought him continually into intercourse with freethinkers of various kinds. The printing-room and the bookseller's shop have ordinarily been much frequented by such persons; and Sheffield from time immemorial has been rather notorious for the number of infidels among its population. In such a situation, if he had hardened himself against the claims and influences of religion, a youth so sanguine and independent—and whose political sympathies and tendencies we know to have been in the direction of the low and visionary radicalism which in that tempestuous season of public events, while France was rioting in the new-found license of her revolutionary epoch, had to a very considerable extent, though in a mitigated form, taken possession of very many of the most ardent, and not, perhaps, the least noble spirits in Britain, including Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge—would probably have been led into infidelity; but having yielded to the grace of Christ, the very circumstances which might otherwise have exerted an influence so pernicious, became, under Providence, an important element in that intellectual and spiritual training which prepared him to become the illustrious and successful champion in later years of orthodoxy against Unitarianism, and of Christianity against presumptuous and insolent infidelity.

Pye Smith's conversion was very decisive; the change was not gradual, but sudden and marked; and the contrast was great between what he had been and what, under the influence of converting grace, he suddenly became. We have indeed no particulars of the date and manner of his conversion. The course of Pye Smith's experience was through life a "hidden brook," though it gave out the sweet "music" of a holy and beneficent life and conversation. His spiritual life was, in a peculiar sense, "a life *hid* with Christ in God." Yet this fact of the suddenness and decision with which the bias of his mind was changed, and his character "transformed

by the renewing of his mind," is one which deserves special notice. It seems to have tended greatly to secure his faith and footing as a Christian in days to come. Perhaps the most remarkable feature in Dr. Smith's character was the way in which he combined firmness and tenacity in adherence to the fundamental Christian faith with freedom of investigation as to the evidences of that faith, and large tolerance of opinion as to points not fundamental. He felt that he was securely anchored, and he could calmly note the bearings of all the objects surrounding his position, and take his soundings so as to discriminate between shore and sea-drift, deep and shallow. Knowing that he held by a good bottom, he swung freely and rode at ease. He felt the force of tides and currents, and even of the tempest, from the rage of which he was secure in the haven; yet they never had power to dislodge him from the circle within which he revolved in safety. We know of no man who was his equal in this respect; he had a candid ear for every objection against his faith, he could steadily contemplate the greatest difficulties which surrounded it, he could calmly, though reverently, investigate the most fearful of the mysteries which environ the present state of human existence, and yet his head never seems to have reeled, nor his eye to have blanched, nor his sure trust and confidence to have failed in that truth which, to him, had proved the power of God unto salvation.

Pye Smith was formally admitted a member of the Church under the care of Mr. Brewer, to which his parents belonged, on a profession of his Christian faith and hope, November 21, 1792. We have already stated that his conversion was a decided and a sudden change; yet it appears, from the brief paper containing his profession, which still remains, that his passage from a sense of condemnation and dread to one of confidence and love was *not* momentary, but gradual. Some of the Sabbath memorials which, about this time, he was accustomed to write, are deeply interesting. They show a very devout, earnest, and watchful spirit. About the year 1793, if not earlier, communications took place between young Smith and some of his friends respecting his becoming a minister. His father, however, for a long period after this,—indeed, until some time after he had completed his apprenticeship,—was unwilling to give up his son's services from the business. Perhaps, also, his parents were laudably anxious that he should not "run before he was sent." Meantime young Smith began to show that zeal and concern for the salvation of others which is one of the signs of a genuine conversion.

In 1796 we find Pye Smith in a new and a perilous sphere, supplying the place of his friend James Montgomery, as editor of the

Sheffield Iris, during the time that the poet was suffering imprisonment in York Castle for what had been adjudged, according to the law as it then stood, to be a libel on the conduct of the Sheffield Volunteers in quelling a popular tumult. So decided, perhaps we should say extreme, at this time were Pye Smith's politics, that Montgomery found it necessary gently to moderate his friend's zeal; yet, on the whole, he seems to have conducted the paper during the time it was under his management with prudence as well as competent ability. Many years after this, at the meeting of the Congregational Union in Sheffield, in 1849, James Montgomery dined at the Music Hall with about two hundred and fifty Congregationalist gentlemen. In the course of the proceedings after dinner, he alluded in a very interesting way to his early connexion with Dr. Pye Smith. It appears that they were united in loftier and serener pursuits than any connected with politics. "He occasionally accompanied his friend in preaching expeditions to the villages, to enjoy the benefit of hearing him." In farm-houses, and in barns, he thus attended Pye Smith's early ministry. Surely this association of the Christian poet with the profound, but humble theologian, is more than ordinarily interesting. Montgomery, who survived his friend a little more than two years, has now joined him in a better country, where their several gifts are merged in lowly adoration and enraptured praise.

Pye Smith seems to have begun to preach or exhort about 1793, that is, at nineteen years of age. At first his parents offered some opposition to his engaging in any such work as this. He remained at home not only long enough to complete the term of his apprenticeship, but nearly eighteen months longer; and only left when his own respectful arguments, the concurrent advice of friends, and the direct, but unsought sanction and recommendation of the Church, had at length completely silenced and subdued his father's objections, and secured the cordial, though late approval of his mother, at least, and probably of his father also. This took place in 1796, when Pye Smith was twenty-two years of age. How beautiful to see a young man of so sanguine a temper as we know to have belonged to him, of disposition and principles so independent, and withal of such ability and attainments, deporting himself toward his parents so meekly and unblameably!

At this time it appears he was highly respected in Sheffield. In his own Church, during the pastoral vacancy, he had been occasionally called upon to preside at Church meetings, and to deliver the address to newly-admitted members. In a larger and more public sphere, too, he must have already attracted some attention, mainly,

perhaps, in consequence of his political connexion with Montgomery. Three or four notes remain, addressed to him by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, of about this date. And a little later, we find William Roscoe, author of the *Life of Lorenzo de Medici*, corresponding with him.

No sooner had Pye Smith gained his parents' consent to his devoting himself to the work of the ministry, than he lost no time in procuring entrance to Rotherham College, which was then under the care of Dr. Edward Williams. The Dissenting Colleges, or Academies, of 1796, were not what they are now. The students were few; two tutors sufficed for all branches of instruction; the curriculum was at once more limited and much more superficial than at present; and there was no University at which the alumni of the "Academy" could graduate. Young Smith, destitute as he had been of everything like regular instruction, seems, nevertheless, to have been regarded by his fellow-students as a prodigy of learning. The Latin orations, of which he delivered one yearly during the last three of his four years' residence at College, show a Latinity so vigorous, elevated, and generally pure, that we feel assured not many Oxford men, at that day, could have exceeded these productions of the self-taught son and apprentice of the Sheffield bookseller. His range of reading, too, was very wide. "He was not only a superior linguist, but was skilled in natural history, anatomy, and some branches of medicine." He lectured on anatomy to his fellow-students; and often declaimed from the library rostrum for the instruction and entertainment of his companions on any subject he thought proper.

"There was one thing in Mr. Smith," says one, who at this time knew him well, "which completely puzzled all the students, if not his tutors also, namely, his time, manner, and course of study. I do not think he had any class-mates except in divinity; for all looked up to him, not as a class-mate, so much as an oracle. They all saw, and probably envied, his treasures of knowledge, newly acquired, flowing in from *some* quarter, but could not imagine where he had them; as they had apparently the same sources, as to books, instruction, &c. It was observed that he never appeared a hard, *fagging* student, nor a plodding reader poring his eyes out over books. He seemed to tear out their entrails by violence; and one might almost think him an exception to the common aphorism, *sine labore dicitur nil mortalibus*. He paid occasional visits among his numerous friends; and took his regular turn to supply distant congregations, and probably was in no excessive hurry home to the muses. Yet his mind was always at work, always in advance, always accumulating. I believe the whole secret was his most uncommon quickness of perception and judgment, which enabled him to see through systems of every kind at a glance, or with comparatively little application, though, doubtless, he must have had his *toilsome moments*, as well as inferior minds. His piety at college, a place often trying to the piety of young students, was kept up by diligent private devotion, and by the regular perusal of practical works of religion, such as Baxter's *Saint's Rest*, Halyburton's *Life*, and several of Flavel's writings."—*Memoirs*, p. 49.

Mr. Smith left Rotherham College in 1800. His character was already so far established that, prior to the completion of his fourth year at college, negotiations were entered upon with reference to his undertaking the office of classical tutor at Coward College, then situated at Wymondley, in Hertfordshire. In connexion with this negotiation he visited Wymondley toward the close of 1799. "During this visit he was strongly impressed with a sense of the importance of providing for a probationary term of three months' residence, before any young man was to be considered as fully admitted to the benefits of the college." His object was to gain satisfactory evidence of the true conversion of the candidates for admission. Not being able to agree with the authorities upon this point, he turned his back upon Wymondley one winter's day, and resumed his studies at Rotherham. The point upon which Mr. Smith differed from the managers of Coward College was one upon which his views remained unaltered to the last. Indeed, time only strengthened them, and he lived to see his principle universally recognized in orthodox colleges. He thus expresses his sentiments upon this point, in the "Observations and Advices addressed to a Student entering upon his Theological Studies," which form the introduction to the "First Lines of Christian Theology:"—

"I take for granted that you are a TRUE CHRISTIAN, born again of the Holy Spirit, washed, and justified, and sanctified, taking up your cross daily, and following the holy Jesus. If you are, at this moment, conscious of the contrary—if your own heart bears witness that you have never known a saving renewal unto vital holiness—I charge you, in the name of the eternal and most holy Jehovah, and by all the terrors of his most tremendous and fiery wrath, to stop here. If you presume to advance, know that every step you take is a swift approach to hell—that every line you write is a sentence of damnation. Stop here nor dare to proceed till your hypocrisy and wickedness are forgiven you—till you have solid reason to conclude that you are no longer in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity.

"O merciful, almighty, and most holy Saviour! never, never permit an unregenerate wretch, however deep his self-delusion and specious his profession, to pass this boundary and become a curse to thy blessed cause, and the author of ten-fold destruction to his own soul! Amen! Amen!"—*First Lines of Theology*, pp. 2, 3.

The firmness and decision manifested by Pye Smith on this point at so early a period of his life, and when his position was as yet to be gained, are very remarkable, and equally creditable. It is not, however, likely that, apart from this, he could have found a congenial or permanent home at Wymondley, since some of the trustees of Coward College at this time held Arian views.

Although Mr. Smith had been willing to enter upon the engagements of classical tutor, yet he did not on that account, at this time, nor, indeed, did he at any time, give up his conviction that he was

called of God to occupy the pastoral office. The latter he felt was his primary vocation; the other might be collaterally combined with it, or merged in it and made subsidiary thereto. He might be tutor and pastor, or tutor over those to whom he also discharged the office of pastor; but having the pastoral call and the pastoral heart, he could not be satisfied without performing pastoral service and work. Hence we are informed by his biographer that "soon after his return to Rotherham, and before the close of his term of residence, he went to Chester, to supply a vacant pulpit, with a view to the pastoral office in that city." Here his ministry seems to have been highly acceptable; yet, for some reason, he did not enter on the vacant charge. Probably his attention was turned in another direction by an application which was made to his tutor and to himself, in the same year, (1800,) in reference to his undertaking the classical tutorship at Homerton College. He accepted the invitation, and entered upon his duties at Homerton with the new year—1801.

Homerton College was, we believe, the oldest theological seminary connected with the Nonconformists in England. It was established in the year 1743, and was a fruit of the coalescence of two Dissenting institutions, the Congregational Fund Board and the King's-Head Society. The former of these was established in 1695, to assist poor congregations in the support of their ministers, and to provide for the education of suitable young men for the ministry. The latter institution dates from the year 1730, and was intended to provide means for resisting the spread of the prevailing errors of the day, by setting forth the opposing fundamental truths of evangelical doctrine, and also, like the Congregational Fund Board, by training candidates for the Christian ministry in the principles of orthodoxy and practice of piety. This "society" held its periodical meetings at a godly hostelry, known by the sign of the *King's-Head*, the proprietor of which was one of its members. From this somewhat remarkable circumstance, the society received its distinctive name. This society established a weekly lecture during certain months of the year. The lecturers were, of course, Congregational ministers, and their lectures were regularly published. Subsequently, this became a monthly lecture, and, in after years, Dr. Pye Smith was frequently called upon to be the lecturer. Eventually it dwindled to a yearly sermon, and about 1827 it wholly ceased. Homerton College was managed by a committee, representing both the institutions of which we have spoken, and was maintained till the year 1850. In that year the present new college was formed by the coalition of the interests respectively represented in Homerton,

Highbury and Coward colleges, when, of course, the separate existence of these three institutions terminated. We may add that Coward College was the same in which Doddridge had taught at Northampton, and Belsham at Daventry, and from which Pye Smith had turned away at Wymondley. It is to be feared that Doddridge, great and pious a divine as he undoubtedly was, had yet prepared the way for the heterodoxy which had already tainted the college, when Belsham became its tutor. During Belsham's presidency we need not say that first Arianism, and then decided Socinianism had extensively leavened the institution; and when Pye Smith turned away from its doors, we have already seen that Arianism was still the creed of some of its managing trustees. In after years, however, Coward College is understood to have become truly orthodox. We may be sure that otherwise it would scarcely have been merged in the new college, over which Dr. Harris so worthily presides.

Pye Smith's "Address to the Students of the Congregational Academy at Homerton, delivered on occasion of entering upon the office of Resident Tutor," is reprinted in full in his biography. It is remarkable for its spirit of Christian meekness and its tone of graceful, brotherly courtesy. In this respect it is a beautiful model of the manner in which a young tutor should address himself to win and guide his pupil-brethren. But the course which he sketched for himself was undoubtedly far too large to be filled up properly by any one man, however energetic and accomplished, or to be gone over by the students in four years. It embraced "three successive and connected courses of lectures" on natural philosophy, chemistry, and natural history, and a fourth on astronomy; courses of lectures on logic, ontology, and rhetoric; and in the study and use of history; regular studies in elementary mathematics; a course of exegetical lectures on the New Testament, and lectures and exercises on classical literature and on the Hebrew tongue. This outline, however, serves to show the extent of the territory which Pye Smith had himself, to a large extent, overrun and mastered, and exhibits his views as to the necessity of large and liberal culture in all departments of sterling knowledge—and especially in natural science, as not less important than literature—in order fully and adequately to furnish a minister of the gospel for the position which he ought to occupy as priest of truth for the God of the Bible, tithing all for his glory, bringing into his temple the first-fruits of all, that his proprietorship may be vindicated, and all be sanctified to him. Too often has science been the votary of false gods and usurping idols. This must be so, if the ministers of the true God will not com-

mand her allegiance to their God—if they sullenly scowl at her tokens, and mock or anathematize her discoveries. Pye Smith saw from the first—much earlier than Chalmers himself—what was the right course to be taken in this matter. In this inaugural address at Homerton, we discover the same characteristics which, in after years, gave him as wide a fame, in one circle, by his lectures on geology, as he had previously acquired, in other circles, by his “Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.” The work which for many years he tried to compass at Homerton, but which it was impossible for any one man really to accomplish, he lived to see provided for in the new college by a large and competent staff of professors.

When Pye Smith entered Homerton College, and for many years after, the classical tutor was also the college president, and had the entire economical management and responsibility of the college. This was an onerous situation for an inexperienced bachelor, especially as the allowances for expenses were calculated on obsolete data, and on a very low scale. Moreover, 1801 was a famine year in Britain, the average price of wheat for the year being about double the price of plentiful years. Under these circumstances, Mr. Smith allowed himself to contract a hasty and ill-assorted marriage with a lady of property. She was, indeed, a person of education, abilities, and Christian character, and had recently left the Church of England and embraced Dissenting principles. But she was a woman of a parsimonious disposition and of an imperious will. Her parsimony was aggravated and rapidly developed, because of the circumstances under which she began housekeeping, and of the pecuniary difficulties under which her husband laboured for several years. But it grew into a dreary monomania, which all the arguments and entreaties of her husband, sometimes most pathetically and powerfully urged in writing, could not mitigate. Such a character as hers seriously interfered with Mr. Smith's relations to the students, so that in 1807 he was compelled to resign his office into the hands of the managing committee of the college; on which occasion, however, the committee showed their high esteem of his character and services, by requesting him to undertake the office of Divinity Tutor, a request to which he acceded. Still, however, the evil influence was most painfully felt by Mr. Smith, even though non-resident. His house was a seclusion to which no student or friend could be invited, his correspondence was painfully restricted, his private library was seldom enlarged by the purchase of a volume, his precious time was frittered away, when not in college, by occupations which should have been undertaken by domestic helps of another order, and his means of beneficence were most unhappily curtailed. Add

to this, that his children were not taught to reverence their excellent father, though, indeed, they did so, and could not but do so; and our readers may conceive the cup of domestic affliction which for thirty years Pye Smith had ever to drink. What made the whole yet more painful was, that for many years of this time there was not the slightest reason for any such feelings as Mrs. Smith entertained. She dreaded poverty in the midst of affluence. How alien all this was from Pye Smith's temper and principles became at once apparent as soon as the death of his wife gave him the opportunity to reverse, in every respect, the course which he had maintained. Some may think that Dr. Smith should, at all hazards, have broken through this bondage. But what this might have cost who can calculate? Nor could a minister in his position, or of his spirit, have risked or borne a public exposure. He endured this as his trial—as his thorn in the flesh—meekly and in faith. He felt, no doubt, that in part he had brought it upon himself; and we have ample evidence that this great calamity and sore trial was richly sanctified to him.

In 1802 Pye Smith commenced a mineralogical collection, which he continued to increase, more or less, from that time. Mineralogy seems to have been a favourite science with him, until this was merged in geology. In 1803 he published—several other publications having preceded in former years—a discourse, entitled, *The Divine Glory displayed in the Permission of Sin*. This was delivered at the *monthly lecture*, to which we have before referred, as were ten others of his published discourses. We refer to it, however, as an instance of the calmness with which Pye Smith could contemplate the deepest mysteries, to look at which steadily would have made most other heads reel. He appears in this sermon as the decided Necessitarian and Calvinist, a worthy disciple of Jonathan Edwards and Dr. Williams. Such he remained till the end of his days. He maintains that “sin is a privation, an absence, a defect, not among the number of positive beings,” and, therefore, “not among the creatures which the Almighty Maker has formed.” He further maintains the two following propositions:—“1. The sole and proper origination of sin is from the *necessary* condition and circumstances of created and finite existence, when destitute of a sovereign prevention.” “2. The acknowledged fact, that God did not interfere to prevent the occurrence of sin, was an exercise *not of sovereignty*, but of *PURE JUSTICE*.” (See *Memoirs*, p. 118.) By all, we suppose, but Calvinists, these two propositions would be thought mutually inconsistent. Pye Smith, however, held that both were true, and both consistent. This, at least, is bold and resolute Calvinism. Pye Smith was a *real* Calvinist, and understood his creed. He

was, however, as an expositor of Scripture, a very moderate Calvinist; and, practically, he was most tolerant and liberal in his judgment of persons of another creed, however diametrically opposed to his own. His Calvinism does not seem to have been at all the deduction of his Scripture inquiries, but a logical inference from his philosophy and metaphysics. He belonged to what has been loosely called the sensationalist school of philosophy, was an admirer of Hartley, loved by a strict logic to embrace and investigate all things, and applied the principles of physics to spiritual affections and acts. Hence he became a philosophical Necessitarian, and a Calvinist in religious doctrine.

In 1804 Pye Smith became, with the concurrence of the authorities of the college, pastor of a very small Church, then first formed, in connexion with the college, and assembling for worship at first in the hall of the college. The number was only seven, including Mr. Smith; but in the course of years the Church grew into a considerable body. A few years afterward it occupied the Old Gravel-pit Meeting-house, then just vacant by the removal of Mr. Belsham, where it still meets. Of this Church Pye Smith was pastor forty-five years. His pastoral experience and engagements heightened and ripened all his other qualifications for the office of Divinity Tutor. In connexion with his engaging in the office of pastor, Pye Smith drew up two documents, one a "Church covenant," which is remarkable, because, while very explicit on all points of catholic, Christian, and evangelical doctrine, it entirely avoids any reference to the peculiarities of the Calvinistic creed; the other, a "confession of faith," read by himself on occasion of his public ordination to the pastoral office, and which is equally remarkable for the perspicuity and fulness with which it states his views on all the main points of Christian doctrine, as held by decided, though not extreme Calvinists. The distinction between these documents may be easily accounted for. Though a decided Calvinist himself, and bound clearly and fully to state his own doctrine before his ministerial brethren, Pye Smith was no bigot, and did not wish to preclude any evangelical Christian from communion with his own Church.

Mr. Smith's position at Homerton had brought him into immediate contact with the Rev. Thomas Belsham. For seventy or eighty years the Old Gravel-pit Meeting-house, Homerton, had had a succession of Arian or Socinian ministers. First Dr. Price, then Dr. Priestley, and then Mr. Belsham, had preached there. Mr. Belsham was the minister from 1794 to 1805, when he removed to Essex-street Chapel, in the Strand, London. On the death of Dr. Priestley in 1804, Mr. Belsham preached a commemorative discourse

at Homerton, which he published, and of which he sent a copy to Mr. Smith. This discourse Mr. Smith felt it his duty to answer. Hence the *Letters to Belsham*, which were published in 1804, and again a second edition in less than twelve months after. We have seen that while still comparatively a youth at Sheffield, Pye Smith had been led to examine carefully, and, we might almost say, controversially, the cardinal doctrine of Christ's Godhead. In his position at Homerton in 1804, we mark another in that train of circumstances which, under Providence, prepared him for the great work of his life, the production of a complete, condensed, conclusive argument on the subject. The *Letters to Belsham* were candid, courteous, learned, and able. They at once produced a great impression; and many Christians, from this time, looked to the young tutor at Homerton, then in his thirty-first year, whose maiden-work on this controversy gave such evidence of calm and modest power, as the future champion of orthodoxy in this argument. Need, indeed, there was that some one should arise to do battle for the truth. The ability of Dr. Price, the reputation of Priestley, the learning of Wakefield, the conversion from orthodoxy of Theophilus Lindsay, once a clergyman of the Church of England, the plausibility and assurance of Belsham, had carried the hopes of Unitarianism in a shallow and feeble age, when, beyond the pale of Methodism, there was little good and nothing powerful, to a greater height than they have reached before or since. But already Wardlaw in the north, and Smith in the south of Britain, were beginning to bestir themselves and to set the battle of Scripture truth in array against the Socinian foe. The "*Letters to Belsham*" procured for Dr. Smith the diploma of D. D. from Yale College in 1807: so early did America recognize the merit of the young divine.

The *Eclectic Review* was commenced in January, 1805. From the first Pye Smith contributed to this Review, and he continued to do so as long as his energy served him for periodical writing at all. The number and variety of his articles on subjects of science and classical literature, as well as of sacred criticism and general religious interest, attest his extraordinary diligence and manifold accomplishments. In 1806 we find him setting an excellent example for a college tutor, by engaging in out-of-door preaching. Upon his doing this, the vicar of Homerton addressed to him a courteous remonstrance, which called forth from Mr. Smith a defence of what he had done. In 1807 he was mainly instrumental in originating Mill-Hill Protestant Dissenters' Grammar School, (near London,) the quarterly examinations of which he attended with punctual exactness and fatherly interest, till within a year of his decease.

Upon the first day that this school was opened, Richard Winter Hamilton and Thomas Noon Talfourd entered it. The former became afterward a Dissenting minister, resident from first to last, we believe, at Leeds, and distinguished as an accomplished wit and man of letters, a profound divine, an eloquent preacher and writer, and a catholic Christian; a most genial, kindly man. The latter became afterward the poet, scholar, and judge; and expired when in the act of impressing upon a British grand jury sentiments the most enlightened, benevolent, and Christian, in reference to the mutual relations of the different classes of his countrymen.

From 1805, Mr. Smith had provisionally discharged the office of Divinity Tutor as well as Classical Tutor. In December, 1807, he received the resident tutorship; and in 1808 he removed to a new residence, as Divinity Tutor. From this date we must speak of him as Dr. Pye Smith. He was now engaged in his *proper* work. However competent he might be for the classical tutorship, his heart was in divinity. Sacred science was his most congenial study. To this all else in his wide range of inquiries converged; the home and end of all his contemplations was the knowledge of God. His instructions as Divinity Tutor embraced a purely theological course, the syllabus of which in its most complete form, and ably edited and supplemented, is now published as the "First Lines of Theology," of which we have given the full title at the head of this paper; Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, said to have been exceedingly complete and valuable; Lectures on Biblical Antiquities, and Criticism on Polemical Divinity, and the Exegesis of the New Testament. He still continued, also, to lecture on Mental and Moral Philosophy, Rhetoric, and various branches of Natural Science. He also required the students in rotation to deliver a discourse before himself and the class as a pulpit exercise. As Homerton College was not capable of accommodating many students, the number never much exceeding twenty, Dr. Smith's theological class seldom contained more than ten or twelve students. It may be proper to mention that from the time of his entering Homerton, Pye Smith's pulpit services had been in much request, and that they continued to be so for years after this time.

In 1811 Dr. Smith's congregation for the first time entered upon the occupancy of the chapel which Mr. Belsham had recently vacated, the Old Gravel-pit Meeting-house. The following year a circumstance occurred which created a great deal of excitement at the time, and which is strikingly illustrative of the character of Dr. Smith. At this period he was unsettled in his views in reference to the intermediate state; and he frankly stated his condition of mind

to his congregation, in a sermon on 2 Cor. v, 1-4. After a more thorough study of the subject, he again preached on the same text, and presented the evidence in favour of the prevailing belief among Christians, in a light at once satisfactory to himself and to his people.

This affair, combined with *perhaps* some other instances of similarly honest, but probably unguarded frankness in intercourse with his pupils, led to rumours and suspicions very seriously affecting Dr. Smith's position as theological tutor. The sudden withdrawal of one of the students, after only a few weeks' residence at Homerton, added to the growing prejudice. Under these circumstances he felt it necessary to call for an inquiry. The inquiry terminated most honourably for Dr. Smith, nine out of eleven of the committee agreeing in a report which substantially exculpated the theological tutor, and expressed the strongest confidence in his orthodoxy. The two dissentients, however, appealed to the press, and the consequence was that Dr. Smith published by way of rejoinder three pamphlets in quick succession, extending to one hundred and sixty pages, and bearing the title of *Vindiciæ Academicæ* and *Sequel to Vindiciæ Academicæ*. In these he says:—

"Perhaps I have carried my notion of the duty of openness and the evil of reserve to an excess. But to this side still would I incline, rather than to its opposite of concealments and reservations. . . . If in relation to some of the most difficult questions that can occupy the attention of the human mind, I have paused, and paused long, before I could venture to draw a positive conclusion;—if I have declined to confound the gradations of moral evidence in one undistinguishing and headstrong pretence of confidence;—if, so long as hesitation existed, I have not refused to own it, when a just occasion demanded the acknowledgment;—this will not greatly surprise nor deeply offend the man of sense or the thinking Christian."—*Memoirs*, p. 207.

There is force in these apologies; yet surely it must be confessed that it is a thing extremely undesirable that a theological tutor should not have fully settled, after whatever amount of careful examination, his own convictions on all points of principal or even secondary importance, before he undertakes to be the guide and instructor of youthful students. By the time this painful controversy was brought to an end, letters of congratulation had reached Dr. Smith from many quarters; and, among the rest, one was received, of a very cordial character, from Robert Hall, who had had his own struggles of a similar description.

During the same year in which the discussion to which we have referred took place, 1813, Dr. Smith, besides preparing and publishing an ordination-charge, published the most elaborate of his printed discourses, that on *The Sacrifice of Christ*, (which formed the basis

of his well-known and admirable work, long afterward published, on *The Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ*,) with notes as long as the text. And for the last five months of the year, the health of the classical tutor having failed, he discharged his duties in addition to his own, and sustained the whole burden of tuition. He had done this before, and did it again and again in later years. Let us say in this place, that, in the present sketch, we do not pretend to catalogue all Dr. Smith's numerous publications, and take no notice whatever of the varied and valuable contributions which he was continually furnishing to the *Eclectic Review*.

In 1818 Dr Smith published the first volume of his greatest work, *The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*. Just as he was preparing to send it forth to the world, he suffered a most painful bereavement in the removal, at the age of fourteen, of his eldest son, Philip Henry, who appears to have been a most interesting and promising youth. He had lost before an infant child, his father, and a sister. But this was the keenest sorrow of his life. He refers to it in a most affecting passage in the preface to the first edition of the *Scripture Testimony*, which we quote because this preface has been omitted from the later editions of the work:—

"Scarcely has he sent the last sheets to the press when all his other feelings are swallowed up in one keen distress. He had a son, the joy of his heart, and the object of many a delightful, though trembling, anticipation. When these anticipations were beginning to be realized; when he was just stepping into the place of an associate and a friend; when his character and attainments were opening to prospects of exquisite gratification; in the very fulness of life, health, and vigour, it has pleased the all-wise and righteous Sovereign to take him from the arms of his agonized parents by a sudden and overwhelming stroke.

"Non sum ambitiosus in malis, nec augere lacrymarum caussas volo: utinamque esset ratio minuendi! Sed dissimulare qui possum, quid illi gratiæ in vultu, quid jucunditatis in sermone, quos ingenii igniculos, quam præstantiam placidæ mentis ostenderit? Tuos ne ego, O meæ spes inanes, labentes oculos, tuum fugientem spiritum vidi? Tuum corpus frigidum, exsangue complexus—animam recipere, auramque communem haurire amplius potui?"*

"But though the bereaved and sorrowing writer can so justly borrow these lamentations, he cherishes a *hope* which that illustrious mourner never knew."—*Memoirs*, p. 237.

If any doubt on the subject which five years before had so perplexed and distressed his mind, might occasionally have risen up again to disturb his peace, may we not feel assured that all such doubts were now laid to rest in the sepulchre of this beloved son; and that, as Robert Hall is said to have buried his materialism in his father's grave, so Pye Smith from this time ceased not to look upon the "intermediate state" as one in which all the dead "live unto God?"

* Quintilian, *Institut.*, lib. vi, Proœm.

The *Scripture Testimony* was announced, it would seem, in 1812; but it was 1818 before even the first volume appeared. To this the author refers in the "Preface" from which we have already quoted. We cannot quote the passage in full. Suffice it to say, that it affords a melancholy glimpse into the domestic obstructions which had so greatly impeded the progress of the vigorous and industrious writer. "Had he been able," he says, "to bestow upon this work as many months of unbroken time as have elapsed of years since it was begun, it would long ago have been completed."—*Memoirs*, p. 100. The second volume of this work was published in 1821, extending, in its original form, to more than eight hundred pages.

In 1826 Dr. Smith addressed a letter to his friend Robert Haldane, on the subject of inspiration, from which we shall give an extract. Mr. Haldane was an adherent of the theory of verbal inspiration, in its most extreme form. Dr. Smith says:—

"Your style of writing seems to *imply* it to be essential to the character of a genuine disciple of the Lord Jesus that he hold that the *INSPIRATION* of the Scriptures consisted in this, that every phrase and word of the Scriptures was suggested, or enjoined by the Holy Spirit to the writers; so that, in fact, theirs was, or at least needed to be, no other than a mechanical labour. Permit me to request your kind, but rigorous and scrutinizing attention to some brief remarks on this subject, in a work entitled '*Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*,' vol. i, pp. 62, 63, and 27–29. Allow me also to ask and observe some things which now occur to me:—1. How is this view of inspiration to be transferred to any *versions*? 2. It appears to me to be clogged with very serious and inextricable difficulties; and that the contending for it is likely to bring great detriment to the evidence and interests of evangelical truth. At the same time it is one of those subjects which ought to be considered and settled without any respect of favour or disfavour to any system of doctrine. 3. After the attention of about thirty years to this subject, a view, of which the following is an outline, appears to me to be the *truth* on this subject. Yet I trust I have well considered what you have advanced in your excellent work on the '*Evidences and Authority of Divine Revelation*':—

"1. That the essential seat of the inspiration lies in the *thoughts and sentiments*, whatever be the variety of phrase by which they may be expressed. The inspiration of God, therefore, extends to all metaphrases and translations, provided they be *equipollent* in meaning.

"2. That though the inspired writers used the diction which was most familiar to them, according to their characteristic style and verbal habits, yet in all cases the original Hebrew, Chaldee, or Greek, is the best expression of the '*mind of the Spirit*.' For either the very words and phrases were suggested by the Holy Spirit, (most probably so in prophetic declarations and messages,) or were accepted, so to speak, by him; which two cases are precisely the same in practical effect.

"3. That, in historical narration, (under which I include all relations of the feelings, fears, sorrows, temptations, deliverances, &c., of individual believers, or of the Church as a body; e. g., the Book of Job, that of Lamentations, and many of the Psalms,) all that we want are due selection and faithful statement; and these inspiration secures.

"4. That, in the didactic parts, the apostles, &c., wrote as they were in the habit of speaking. Each, in both kinds of communication, uttered what he had '*seen and heard*,' what '*he had received from the Lord*,' in the entire

exercise of his own judgment and affections, and with, it may be, a perpetual variety of expression, *pro re natâ*, yet with a full consciousness of being taught and guided infallibly by the Holy Spirit."

To the letter from which the above is extracted no direct reply was ever given by Mr. Haldane. Soon afterward, however, Dr. Smith became involved in a controversy, carried on in the pages of the *Evangelical Magazine*, on the same subject, with Mr. James Alexander Haldane, the brother of Mr. Robert Haldane, who concealed his name under the signature *Aletheia*. This was before the end of the year 1826. The following year, however, the whole controversy was reopened, in another form, by Dr. Alexander Carson, who attacked Dr. Smith in a style which, for truculence and atrocity, has, perhaps, never been exceeded even under the inspiration of the *odium theologicum*. Dr. Smith is stigmatized as a traitor, and more dangerous than an open infidel; and as actuated by "a false, a diabolical liberality." All who do not accept the most extreme views of verbal inspiration, are set down as guilty of implicit infidelity. Indeed, the object of the writer might have been to narrow, as far as possible, the limits within which a Christian faith is possible, and to drive as fast and as hard as possible all who might not be able to adopt his own views as to the *mode* of inspiration into open and universal infidelity. Dr. Smith, of course, never replied to this publication. He never took the slightest notice of it. A minister and divine of his eminent piety and exalted position *could not* do so. In his discussions of the question of inspiration in the later editions of the *Scripture Testimony* he refers respectfully, though dissentingly, to the published views of Mr. Robert Haldane on this subject; but to the "pastor of Tubbermore" he never makes the slightest allusion. Little, we presume, did he suspect what is now confessed in the memoirs of the brothers Haldane, published by Mr. Alexander Haldane, that Dr. Carson was prompted by Mr. Robert Haldane to do this work; that this was, in effect, Mr. Haldane's way of replying to Dr. Smith's letter from which we have quoted, and of coming to the rescue of his brother, ("*Aletheia*;") that he paid all the expenses of this illiberal and ferocious publication, and gratuitously distributed it by hundreds. Yet such was the fact, as it now appears. We confess it is with deep grief that we mention, though we cannot but mention, a circumstance so discreditable to the character of a Christian so distinguished, so useful, and so benevolent as the late Robert Haldane. We may add that Dr. Smith's maturest views as to the question of inspiration may be found in a lucid, condensed, and complete form, in his *Scripture Testimony*, 4th ed., vol. i. He had long doubted as to the canonical authority

of the "Song of Solomon;" but the arguments, of some able writers in the Congregational Magazine, (1837-8,) particularly of Dr. James Bennett, had finally convinced him of the canonicity of this book; though as to its purpose and interpretation, he remained still at fault. Dr. Smith's idea of inspiration was not low and rationalizing, otherwise he had doubted less. All his theology, all his faith and hope and peace, were grounded upon the divine authority and infallible truth of Scripture. Hence his conscientious and scrutinizing care in settling the question as to what was entitled to be accounted Scripture. It was necessary that his fulcrum should be firmly fixed before he could apply his lever.

In 1828 Dr. Smith published his *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ*. In 1829 he preached at the "Monthly Lecture," and afterward published, his very valuable discourse *On the Principles of Interpretation as applied to the Prophecies*. In the same year he prepared the second edition of the *Scripture Testimony*, "much improved and enlarged," besides several valuable articles in the *Eclectic Review*, and other separate publications. In the same year also appeared the second edition of his *Scripture Test*, in three volumes. In 1826 he had prepared, by request, and published an able reply to the *manifesto* of the Rev. (!) Robert Taylor, A. B., at that time notorious as the principal leader of a party infamous for bold and blasphemous infidelity. The fourth edition of this work, much enlarged, and including a rejoinder, as the third had done, to Taylor's "Syntagma of the Evidences of the Christian Religion," was published in 1830. The style of this work, though condensed, is remarkably spirited. His sermon on the *Interpretation of Prophecy* was also reprinted this year, in an improved and much enlarged form. In 1832 he lost a most beloved daughter; the same year, also, Mrs. Pye Smith finished her course. The years 1834 and 1835 were signalized by his controversy with his friend Dr. Lee, the Cambridge professor, raised by the latter on a work of Dr. Smith's which expounded the principles of dissent. He did his part in this controversy with great vigour and ability. Within little less than twelve months he carried through the press nearly two hundred and fifty pages of well-digested and carefully written controversy. It need not be said that the temper was admirable; and it is very much to the credit of both the controversialists, that when their discussions had closed, their Christian friendship remained unimpaired. Dr. Smith allowed Professor Lee to have the last word. But his health yielded to these excessive labours; fever and debility supervened, and for a year or two after this his health was feeble.

About this time Dr. Smith had begun to devote special attention to the subject of geology; he had become a regular attendant at the annual meetings of the British Association; and in November, 1836, he became a Fellow of the Geological Society. He soon acquired the acquaintance and friendship of such distinguished geologists as Phillips, Lyell, Buckland, and Sedgwick, with more than one of whom he corresponded; and so he became prepared to undertake, at less than a month's notice, the Congregational Lecture for 1839, on *Revelation and Geology*. This work established his reputation in a new field, and brought him letters of thanks and congratulation, not only from such men of science as Conybeare, Phillips and Mantell in England, but from Professors Hitchcock and Silliman on this side of the Atlantic. It also procured him admission to the Fellowship of the Royal Society, in 1840; an honour which Dr. Doddridge had solicited, but failed to obtain, and for which Smith was proposed and recommended, among others, by Bell, Lyell, Buckland, and Sedgwick.

In 1843 Dr. Smith married a second time; and soon after urged the Committee of Homerton College to allow him to relinquish £100 per annum of his stipend as professor. He again and again afterward urged this request, but the committee would never consent. The same year, after an absence of thirty-six years, he returned to the college as resident tutor—now under different circumstances. In 1845 a number of articles from the pen of Dr. Smith appeared in Kitto's Cyclopædia. These were on the subjects, "Adam," "Dispersion of the Nations," "Nimrod," "Noah," "Paradise," and "Confusion of Tongues."

The fourth edition of the *Scripture Testimony*, reduced from three volumes to two, appeared in 1847. The matter is admirably condensed; the arrangement of the work seems to be perfect; and the edition is, in all respects, a model of elegance and completeness. His *Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ* reached a third edition in this same year, 1847. This standard work forms a beautiful supplement to the treatise on the person of Christ. Together they form an admirable compendium of doctrine on the essentials of Christianity—the person and work of Christ.

In 1848 the lectures on *Scripture and Geology* reached a fourth edition. Each successive edition was carefully revised and supplemented in accordance with the latest discoveries of science. The following year Dr. Smith attended, with great interest, the Peace Congress at Paris. By this time his strength was almost spent, he was slightly paralyzed, and though he still continued to discharge his college duties, it was plain that his day was almost past. Indeed, it

was already settled that as soon as the new college was opened, for establishing which preparations were being made, his functions would be at an end. In 1849 he finally resigned his pastorate, after a ministerial service of forty-five years, having for several years previously been aided by a co-pastor. In May, 1850, he prepared the address for the occasion of laying the first stone of the new college, but was unable to read it himself. In June he wished to attend, for the last time, the public examination of Mill Hill Grammar School, but being unable, prepared an address, which was read by Dr. William Smith—a scholar whose attainments are known throughout the learned world. On June 27 he delivered an address, full of touching interest, at the last anniversary of Homerton College. On October 2 he retired from Homerton, which had been the scene of his labours for nearly fifty years, to Guildford, Surrey, situated at a convenient distance from the metropolis. Here he soon became extremely feeble. He gave up all books but the Bible, and such as *Bunyan's Pilgrim*. He had hoped that rest would recruit him, and that he should be able to carry out plans of revised and extended study; but his work was done, and it was time for him to cease. Still, however, when he could do nothing else, and the effort was extremely painful to him, he exerted to the uttermost his small remaining strength to meet the requirements of friendship, courtesy, and charity, by correspondence, until at length two or three lines were all that he could write. On January 8, 1851, he made a great effort to meet his friends at the London Tavern, in order to receive the *Pye Smith Testimonial*, which was a sum of £2,600, of which the interest was to be enjoyed by himself during his life, and after his death was to be devoted to the maintenance of "Pye Smith Scholarships" at the new college. From this time he rapidly declined, and on the night of February 5, 1851, he expired at Guildford, in the presence of his wife and family, aged seventy-six years, eight months, and eleven days. His last publication, which came out at the beginning of this year, was a second edition of the sermon "On the Reasons of the Protestant Religion; enlarged and adapted to the Popish Aggression of 1850, with some Remarkable Disclosures of Romanist Policy in the Age of the Reformation."

A few remarks upon the character of Dr. Smith, in the various relations which he sustained to the Church and to society, will fitly close this paper.

Pye Smith was a self-taught scholar. He never went to a classical school; indeed, scarcely went to school at all. He never had a

tutor, though, as we have said, a private friend gave him a few desultory lessons in the classics. No university or college of fame gave to him its ample stores and systematic training. The only college he ever entered was an humble dissenting academy for educating gospel ministers; and his classical course, if course it may be called, was in effect complete before he entered there. In all things except theology he was esteemed by his companions less as a fellow-student than as an unfailing oracle. Yet, in after life, Pye Smith was recognised as a mate in scholarship by the greatest scholars of his day, who had been nurtured within the classic cloisters of the national universities, and upheld their honour before the world. From the establishment of the *Eclectic Review* in 1805, he sustained for many years nearly the whole weight of its department of classical criticism, and in this work he won for himself a high reputation from the most competent judges. His masterly critique on Dr. (afterward Bishop) Middleton's work on the Greek article, drew from that distinguished scholar a highly complimentary acknowledgment, although the name of the reviewer was unknown to him. Two years later (1810) Dr. Samuel Butler, who was supposed to be, perhaps, the best classical scholar then living in Britain—for Porson was no more—addressed to Dr. Smith a note of thanks not less complimentary in acknowledgment of a review on the first volume of Butler's *Stanley's Æschylus*, which he had contributed to the *Eclectic*. After the publication of the first volume of his *Scripture Testimony*, Dr. Smith's reputation as both a classical and a Biblical scholar and critic rose higher and spread further, and from this time we find the most distinguished divines and scholars of the Anglican Church counting it no degradation to become the correspondents of the Dissenting Tutor at Homerton, stiff Nonconformist and Old-school Puritan though he was. Dr. Turton (now Bishop of Ely) and Dr. Burton, both Bampton lecturers, and eminently learned divines; Professor Lee, the Orientalist scholar of Cambridge; Dr. Cardwell, the present principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford; the High Churchman Dr. Routh, late president of Magdalen College, Oxford, and who has lately died in his hundredth year;* even Dr. Blomfield, the present Bishop of London; nay, Dr. Pusey himself (prior to the distinct development of Puseyism) were numbered among the friendly correspondents, and some of them among the personal acquaintances of Dr. Smith. In this country we should not think much of this; but in England—old, aristocratic, epis-

* Of Dr. Smith's friendship and correspondence with Dr. Routh nothing is said in the *Memoirs*; but see the *Scripture Testimony*, vol. ii, p. 125.

copal England—with its pomp and pride of Church and university—it is altogether unexampled. Such men as Doddridge and Watts have been friendly with a few of the most liberal bishops and leading clergy of their day; but then they were Nonconformists of a much milder type than Dr. Smith, to whom, notwithstanding, such Churchmen as we have mentioned, dignified in position, and yet more dignified by learning and ability, for the most part very strong in their antipathy to dissent, felt it due to pay not only courtesy, but the meed of scholarly recognition and friendly intercourse.

After Dr. Smith succeeded, in 1807, to the divinity chair at Homerton, he was no longer called upon systematically to pursue classical studies; nor is it to be supposed that the leisure of so thorough a theologian, so assiduous a tutor, and so busy a public man, would be sufficient to allow him to do so. Yet we find so competent a judge as Dr. William Smith, well known as the author of the "Classical Dictionary," and the "Roman Antiquities," and who, during the last years of Dr. Pye Smith's residence at Homerton, was his colleague at the college as classical tutor, bearing strong testimony to the extent and accuracy of his classical learning. Dr. Pye Smith's contributions to the *Eclectic Review* ranged over a wide field of subjects—theology, Biblical criticism, classics, science, and sometimes the history and conflicts of contemporary evangelical Protestantism on the continent of Europe—almost everything, in fact, but poetry, the *belles-lettres*, and mathematics. It is rarely that the same man combines the accomplishments of the divine and of the classical scholar with the attainments of the man of science. The present age has certainly seen no union of qualifications so generally found apart, which deserves to be put in comparison with the case of Dr. Smith, if we except the great instance of Bishop Horsley. He was not a smatterer in these various departments: while in the two former he was a master, he was in the third an accomplished scholar and amateur. An original discoverer in science he could not be expected to be—but he was an original observer, and had taken pains to obtain a practical as well as theoretical acquaintance with the subject. From his youth, as we have seen, he had paid great attention to chemistry, botany, mineralogy, and natural history; in his later years geology became his special study. Geology had by this time established its rightful claim to be counted among the sciences, its main principles had been demonstratively established, and the details of its departments were beginning to be clearly understood. It had become apparent that one grand system of strata, implying a set order of stratification, already approximately determined beyond the power of reasonable and enlightened scepticism, ranged and re-

appeared in *frusta* and in fragments, but still in regular series, over the whole earth, so that, though there might be contemporaneous and substitutionary strata, and though particular strata might sometimes be wanting in any given portion of the grand series, yet the order of succession was never reversed; the superior *here* was never found to change places *elsewhere* with what had been its inferior, or *vice versa*; but on the whole, an unvarying rule of succession and superposition was found to hold, not less orderly and more surely than that in which the different bales of woollen goods are ranged above each other, according to their kinds and qualities, in the best-regulated warehouse. It was proved, too, that the fossils embedded in these successive strata exemplified respectively a similar and correspondent order of succession; and further, that the terrestrial and atmospheric conditions implied by the successive strata agreed precisely, so far as they could be ascertained, with the conditions which must have been necessary for the sustenance in life and well-being of their peculiar fossils. Dr. Smith, therefore, could no longer hesitate to give to this new science of geology a distinguished place among his studies. The long-hidden and deeply-buried antiquities which it brings to light, the successive acts of creation which it lays open to the student's sight, the remarkable manner in which it multiplies the evidences belonging to natural theology, opens to our inspection the natural history, so to speak, of many successive worlds, and shows us the foot-prints of creative power in its glorious and leisurely march through untold millenniums from past eternity till now: such reasons as these could not but commend this noble science to the attention of this truth-loving, God-inquiring man. But he had, besides, a special reason for undertaking its study. There was an apparent discrepancy between the teachings of geology and the cosmogony of Moses. Assuming this apparent to be a real discrepancy, very many good and able men refused to look at the proper evidence of geology, and pronounced the science to be one which could not be consistently believed in but by infidels. On the other hand, free-thinkers of all grades, founding on the same hypothesis, rejoiced in geology as having given the lie to Moses, and broken down the authority of the Bible. But Dr. Pye Smith could neither deny the claims of geology nor give up his Bible. He saw that ultimately the evidence of revealed truth itself must depend upon appeals to reason and matter of fact, not essentially different in kind from those upon which geology rests its claim to be accepted as a science. He was convinced that the claims of the human science were demonstrable on the same principles as those of the sacred book. He

accepted the obvious truths and discoveries of geology as being no less truly, though in a different and inferior sense, revelations of the divine mind and character, than the sayings of the Bible. He felt bound to study, reverence, and believe in God as revealed in his works, no less than in his word. He knew that between different parts of the divine word itself, there had seemed to be discrepancies as plain and direct as those assumed to exist between Genesis and the principles of geology. But patience and research had cleared up many of these. Others yet remained to be cleared up; still what Christian would think of impugning or denying the authority of either of the portions which appear to contradict each other? The true interpretation, when found, may show that there is no real contradiction, nor even a material difference. Or even if *one* of the places should be demonstrably incorrect, still the text may be impaired, or the passage itself may be a gloss. Now Dr. Smith held that likewise God's word and God's works are twin revelations, one of which may be compared with the other, but which cannot really come into collision with each other. If the sense of the one seems to differ from what is most certainly and demonstrably the teaching of the other, we must assume that we have not deduced the right sense; our interpretation is at fault, and must be revised. Acting on these principles, and convinced that the doctrine of the book of Genesis *could not* really oppose such main principles of geology as were, in his opinion, made as indubitably sure as the first truths of astronomy or the axioms of physical science, Dr. Pye Smith set himself to the task of reconciling the one record with the other. He felt that, if he could succeed in this, he should wrest a deadly weapon out of the hand of infidelity; that he might hope to save thousands of young people whom the boasts of freethinkers and the anathemas of Christian teachers were uniting to alienate from the religion of the Bible; and that he should add a new and delightful region to the domains from which the Bible claims homage and tribute to the grand truths upon which its special revelations are based, and which in many places it so expressly and impressively teaches. The result of Dr. Pye Smith's labours in this department was his lectures on *Scripture and Geology*. We do not bind ourselves to every canon laid down, and to every view expounded in this able volume; but we are convinced that it did excellent service to the cause both of science and of sacred truth. That its science was good has been admitted by the most competent authorities; and the reputation of Dr. Smith for spiritual piety and strict orthodoxy silenced the objections, if it did not always still the doubts of evangelical believers. No other man could have done

the service at that time which Dr. Smith accomplished. Since then, in Great Britain, geology and Scripture have been very generally acknowledged not to be irreconcilably opposed to each other. We think it clear that the interpretation of Genesis, which was formerly generally accepted, but which has, ever since the Christian era, been from time to time questioned by expositors of high ability, may have been determined, unconsciously, by established, but erroneous views of cosmogony, by foregone conclusions derived from a now exploded science and philosophy.

We need not dwell upon Dr. Smith's character as a controversialist. His great work, the *Scripture Testimony*, appears to us to contain a perfect argument. How poor is Hengstenberg's Christology compared to this! It is throughout a work of solid, wrought gold. It is a chain, every link of which is perfect. Nor is there any waste in it, either of argument, or learning, or words. All is there that could be desired, but condensed with most conscientious care. The work is concinnate as well as complete. And then the spirit, how tender, how Christian! Nothing finer can be imagined. How cautious and candid is the argument! how careful is the author as to the authority of every text he cites! how anxious on no account to overthrow a single point! There can be no doubt that *Pye Smith's* work alone has done more to stem and turn back the tide of Socinianism which was some years ago setting in on both sides of the Atlantic than all other works put together. Belshamite Unitarianism it fairly put to the rout, to be succeeded by Channingism, and then by the vague and dogmatic spiritualism of these later times. *This* must be met by other weapons. Some Unitarians have gratefully acknowledged this book to have been the means of bringing them to a saving faith in Christ, as unbelievers of another stamp have confessed their obligations for the same result to Dr. Smith's *Scripture and Geology*. We need not here add anything to what we have before said of that excellent supplement to the "*Scripture Testimony*," the *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ*.

As a theologian, Dr. Smith belonged to the old dogmatic school. His methods were, we might say, mathematical; propositions, lemmas, corollaries, figure largely in the pages of his *First Lines of Theology*. Something of the same is also seen in his *Four Discourses*. He had a strong predilection for logic and metaphysics. He often uses *à priori* arguments, and will draw out his logical chain of inferences to a great length, without any misgiving as to the security of each several link. He was well read in the scholastic divines; had caught the spirit, in some degree, of their deductive

method; and in the thirteenth century might have divided the theological empire with Aquinas. He was a logical and metaphysical Necessitarian, and a strict disciple of Jonathan Edwards, but in exegesis a Calvinist of the moderate school. He firmly maintained that it was the apostolic practice, and (by an absolute *ergo*, on the principles of Independent Church polity,) the duty of all Christian pastors and Churches, to celebrate the Lord's supper each Lord's day. For many years he enforced this practice in his own Church, till, finding he was often left alone to the service, he at length was compelled to conform to the usual rule of administering it once a month. He kept up the practice, however, in private, to the last. Perhaps, if Dr. Smith had gone back to the practice of the earliest and most illustrious apostolic Church, that at Jerusalem, he would have been convinced that they "broke bread" in the Lord's supper *daily*. Would he then have felt himself bound to administer daily? The sacrament of baptism he refused to administer unless one at least of the parents was a member of the Church, in this point agreeing rather with Scottish Independents and Presbyterians than with English Nonconformists. His views, as to the obligation of the Sabbath, were peculiar and rather unsettled. We think that they were at all times not very consistent, although, substantially, we have no doubt he was right. And it is delightful to find that while Dr. Smith had his own way of stating and arguing what he felt to be the obligation of keeping holy the Lord's day, he had no laxity of feeling or of conscience in regard to the obligation itself and the manner in which it should be kept. Mrs. Pye Smith, his second wife, who survives her husband, says:—

"Every one knows that a strictly conscientious regard to the sanctity of the Lord's day, formed a prominent habit in the personal and domestic life of the doctor; but all are not aware of the sacrifices he made in order to attain this sacred object. Regularly, invitations were sent to him, as F. R. S., to attend the soirées of the president of the Royal Society. To these the current of taste and of inclination would have carried him; but a higher impulse he was bound to obey. These brilliant assemblies were invariably arranged to take place on Saturday evenings."

The doctor *never went*, because he would not even approach to anything like an infringement of the sanctity of the Lord's day. To him this was indeed the *Lord's day*—the name by which he loved to call it; it was eminently "a delight, holy of the Lord, and honourable," a day of congenial meditation and enjoyment, of holy rest and worship. He systematically abstained from all engagements which would have required him to travel on that day; and he addressed a beautiful letter to his private friend Dr. Cardwell, already named, Clerk of the Closet to Her Britannic

Majesty, requesting him to lay before the queen a respectful and loyal representation of the feeling of the Christians of the country in regard to the Sunday performances of the band at Windsor.

Because Dr. Smith was a divine and a theological tutor, he did not, on that account, think himself compelled to abstain from the exercise of his rights as a citizen. On the contrary, he was a keen, though a truly Christian politician. His politics, our readers are aware, were in his youth sufficiently low, perhaps we must say extreme. Experience modified some of his views, but never changed their general bias and character. He was, to the end of his days, a Whig-Radical. Having property of his own in Yorkshire; and having, also, a vote for the county of Middlesex; being, moreover, for many years, trustee for landed property lying in two other counties, he had four county votes at his disposal. These he always went to give, at whatever cost or inconvenience, and would never receive a farthing toward his expenses. On one occasion he even addressed the electors from the hustings in support of Mr. Hume. He also felt it to be a duty to attend and speak at the anti-Corn Law League, at Manchester. And in 1849 he went, spite of the remonstrances of his friends, to take part in the Peace-Congress at Paris. We could not, in these things, have done *just* as Dr. Smith did, on any side; but we do not presume to condemn his principles or proceedings.

As a preacher, Pye Smith, in early life, was, we may say, even popular. This, however, was not the case during the greater part of his career. His voice was weak; his style, though excellent, was rather suited to the theological lecture in a college than to a pulpit address; his matter was convincing and expository, but he never attempted declamation or impassioned appeal. In fine, his discourses lacked fire and force, and he was destitute of all rhetorical accessories and recommendations. As a teacher he was most fatherly and faithful, vigilant in sympathetic care and concern, and accustomed regularly to hold private conversations with the students. Of his diligence and ability as a teacher we need not speak. His lectures, except those on ecclesiastical history, were delivered extempore from such outlines as are now published in the *First Lines*. Of late years, the lecturer, wearying of his reiterated round, was apt to be too irregular and discursive. Till after the death of his first wife, both the students and his friends were excluded from his society in private; but from that time forward this was entirely reversed. The students had access to him at all times, and were often invited to his house; while his noble library was ever open to them. From this time, too, he delighted to keep up intercourse, both in private and

by letter, with his numerous and ever-multiplying friends. He was largely generous and benevolent, giving away, it would seem, on an average, about one-fifth of his income. At the same time he enriched his library with every new work of merit, theological, classical, and scientific, which appeared in English, German, or French. He had a fine collection of atlases and philosophical instruments. He was an exemplary husband and a most tender father, and his children repaid his love with due affection and reverence. Of *very intimate* friends he had few; though he had so many valuable acquaintances and correspondents. To all persons he was particularly courteous and accessible, and especially painstaking and kind in replying to letters from strangers asking information or a solution of difficulties. The amount of time he gave away to such applicants must have been enormous. The great social disability of his life was deafness, which, during his latter years, almost disqualified him for pastoral visitation and for miscellaneous society.

Dr. Smith, we remark in conclusion, was a Christian of the very highest style. His faith was as firm as it was intelligent; and his spirit was as devout and prayerful as his understanding was strong and well-furnished. He was much with God in private. He sanctified all his undertakings by "the word of God and prayer." This was his solace in a most painful and protracted fight of domestic temptation and affliction; this enabled him to conduct many controversies in an unvarying spirit of Christian gentleness and candour; this preserved his soul from wavering in its fundamental Christian faith, or losing the fervour of its love, while he was weighing with nicest accuracy all arguments that were hostile to the doctrines of the Bible and of the cross; this gave him, in one word, a meekness, serenity, and hope which seem to have been scarcely ever interrupted. Let none venture on such perilous work as he was called upon to undertake without seeking first, and from first to last, a baptism of the same Spirit. So we bid farewell to the memory of the greatest master in theology that English Nonconformity has produced since the close of the seventeenth century.

ART. IV.—THE RELATIONS OF ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM TO CIVILIZATION.

Les Nations Catholiques et les Nations Protestantes comparées sous le triple rapport du bien-être, des lumières et de la moralité. PAR NAPOLEON ROUSSEL. 2 vols. Paris, 1855.

WHAT would have been thought presumption a century ago—what, in fact, was punished with imprisonment in the Bastille—is now a sober truth, a subject for free and open discussion: of Protestantism and Popery, which system has the best claims to the gratitude of society? Does modern civilization spring from the decretals? or is the Bible the safeguard of our institutions, our happiness, our prosperity both material and intellectual? When Voltaire published his *Lettres sur les Anglais*, he may be said to have both stated the problem and partly solved it; this is why we alluded just now to the “durance vile” which, under the *ancien régime*, acted as a check upon those who dreamed of reforms in Church and State. We are thankful to say that in some degree, at least, writers now may speak out their thoughts; and although the French press is still too closely under surveillance, we find no law in the *code pénal* preventing us from asserting and proving that popery is “the mystery of iniquity.” Accordingly, pastor Roussel, well known on both sides of the Atlantic as a smart controversialist, and as a faithful minister of the gospel, has taken up the pen, and now comes before us with a couple of volumes, which we cannot better describe than by saying that they contain the key to the political history of the world in which we live.

Some persons, whose anxiety for the imperishable cause of truth borders almost upon pusillanimity, have felt very much alarmed at the Ultramontane reaction which still keeps disturbing the various ranks of society. That the followers of Jesus are about to pass through some severe ordeal is extremely probable; but can we entertain a doubt as to the issue of the conflict? If the Jesuit party are now straining every nerve, and drawing upon all their resources, it is because they feel that their position is a desperate one; they rush on madly to the last contest with the terrible cry ringing in their ears, “*Roma ruit!*”

M. Roussel is not the only author who has lately pronounced the funeral oration of the Roman Catholic nations; more than one observer has noticed the gradual but sure decay of those political

communities who claim a Latin extraction; the difference, however, between M. Roussel and his brethren of the quill is a great one: he points to the spread of gospel principles as the only safeguard of civilization; while MM. Quinet, de Tocqueville, and Kératry, either just lay the evil bare, or propose some useless remedy, if they propose one at all.

The book we are now considering makes no pretensions to originality. Instead of broaching some new scheme, or launching forth into declamation, M. Roussel prefers the sober but safe plan of dealing with facts. He institutes a parallel between the various nations which cover the face of the globe, and supported by a host of unexceptionable authorities, he proves most satisfactorily that under the three-fold aspect of physical comfort, intellectual culture and moral development, the Protestant communities have decidedly the advantage. Let us make a few extracts.

We are first introduced to a general view of the subject;* it is a kind of statistical survey, enabling the author to arrange under the two following groups the various nations he proposes examining:—

Catholic group.

South America,
Ireland,
The Catholic Cantons of Switzerland,
Austria,
Belgium,
Spain.

Protestant group.

North America,
Scotland,
The Protestant Cantons of Switzerland,
Prussia,
Holland,
England.

Mr. Roussel's way of discussing his data may be thought sometimes fanciful. When he compares Belgium with Holland, for instance, or Austria with Prussia, we can see at once geographical and political reasons which justify such a parallel; but we must confess that we do not perceive so clearly that England, more than any other country, should have been selected as a term of comparison with Spain. In the above series we find neither France nor Italy; M. Roussel has devoted a separate chapter to each of those nations. Italy is Roman Catholicism on the throne; and France, Protestantism on the cross:—Roman Catholicism on the throne with debased, degraded, depraved subjects, whom either fear or superstition has brought under a dotard's rule; Protestantism on the cross, while a population of infidels, who keep oscillating between Voltaire and Louis Blanc, are endeavouring, at the bidding of the Jesuits, to stop the progress of the gospel, and to revive the good old times of Louis XIV.

On the subject of intellectual development, M. Roussel has collected a variety of curious details, compiled from the works of M.

* Roussel, vol. i, *Vue d'ensemble*, p. 8, seq.

M. Schnitzter,* and Moreau de Jonnès.† First of all, we are naturally led to consider the state of primary instruction. Mr. Schnitzter gives us the following summary :—In Saxony, there is one pupil for every six inhabitants; the Netherlands, six; Prussia, six and one-sixth; Great Britain, (England and Wales,) eight; Belgium, nine; Austria, ten and a half; France, eleven. The first four nations are Protestant, the last three are Catholic. If we take the two averages we have :—One pupil for six and a-half Protestants; one pupil for ten Catholics; or, to state the fact in other language, the Protestants who know how to read and write, are to the Catholics in the same ratio as twenty to thirteen. Does Mr. de Jonnès confirm or refute Mr. Schnitzter? We shall judge. His statement gives :—

Great Britain,.....	1 pupil for every 6 inhabitants in 1833		
Switzerland, (Canton of Vaud,)	do. 6	do.	1828
Baden,	do. 7	do.	1825
Bavaria,.....	do. 7	do.	1825
Wurtemberg,.....	do. 8	do.	1827
Netherlands,	do. 10	do.	1826
Prussia,.....	do. 10	do.	1825
Austria,.....	do. 16	do.	1822
France,.....	do. 17	do.	1834
Denmark,	do. 30	do.	1825
Kingdom of Naples,	do. 45	do.	1818
Kingdom of Poland,	do. 100	do.	1823
Portugal,.....	do. 109	do.	1819
Hungary,.....	do. 350	do.	1835
Spain,.....	do. 350	do.	1803

A glance at this list will show that with one exception, on both sides, the first half is Protestant, while the second is Catholic. We can even account for the anomaly respecting Bavaria, by remarking that this Roman Catholic nation, placed in the middle of Protestant communities, must have received the light shining upon it from all quarters, and followed the general impulse. But let us seek a more exact measure, by placing Bavaria among the Catholic nations, and Denmark among the Protestant; if, instead of computing the whole communities, we now reckon individuals, we shall have as an average, one pupil for every one hundred and twenty-four Catholics, and one for every ten Protestants. In order to be still nearer the truth, we reduce the Catholic ratio to one per one hundred, on account of the somewhat old dates affixed to a few of the countries which concur in making up that average; we shall even then obtain the astonish-

* *Statistique générale, méthodique et complète de la France*, 4 vols., 8vo.

† *Statistique de la Grande Bretagne et de l'Irlande*, 2 vols., 8vo.

ing result—ten times more pupils in the whole Protestant nations put together than in the Catholic ones.

M. Roussel very properly remarks that school statistics throw no light upon the intellectual state of the higher classes; a government may find its interest in encouraging the diffusion of elementary knowledge, and at the same time in preventing the spread of every other species of instruction; therefore if we desire to secure a correct view of the intellectual progress of a nation, we must rise above the details of primary education. The census of newspaper readers is a tolerably good test of the degree of intellectual culture in a community; for the great majority derives all its information from the periodical press, and most persons whose occupations make it impossible for them to devote any considerable portion of time to a regular course of mental training, are thankful to find historical or scientific information ready digested for them in the pages of the magazine or review. M. Roussel's calculations lead him to a conclusion which confirms his previous statement respecting schools. The number of copies of periodical publications circulated among the Protestants compared with those which we find in Roman Catholic districts is as nine to one; now we have already ascertained that the correct ratio for the scholars is as ten to one; so we are led to conclude that education generally bears its fruits, and that ten pupils produce nine readers.

These facts, so plainly told and so clearly deduced from documents which it is impossible to question, naturally suggest a few reflections; and we make no apology for laying them before our readers. The power of the periodical press in the present age cannot be overrated. This is a truth which may be deplored by some and looked upon as the abomination of desolation; but it is a truth, and we must make the best of it. Three centuries ago Roman Catholicism would have sent a recusant printer to the dungeons of the Inquisition, and would have held over an unfortunate editor's head, as a kind of sword of Damocles, the law *de hæretico comburendo*. Such coercive measures, however, are impossible now; and so the pope himself, finding it useless to attempt to sweep away the press entirely, endeavours to prove, through the mouth of Cardinal Wiseman, that the Church alone (i. e., the Church of Rome) can correct the abuses and reform the licentiousness of periodical literature. The only thing which astonishes us in his reverence's lecture, is that in the course of his allusion to the low state of popular publications in France, he does not frankly acknowledge how much the system of popery has contributed to bring about such a state of things. "*Me, me, adsum qui feci*," should have been the cardinal's deeply-felt

exclamation. But no, he does not confess that the storm he purposes to quell is of his own raising; people, he feels confident, will not be easily led to believe that he who has accumulated the filth in the Augean stables is the best qualified to clear it off again.

We have selected France as the fittest example in this case, for a very obvious reason. In that country public opinion has always had extraordinary power. Under Voltaire's reign, "the brethren of the quill" ruled the destinies of Europe. Who was Frederick the Second's tutor? Who advised the empress Catherine, and governed even the pope? Who but those *philosophers*, now-a-days represented by MM. Michelet, Eugene Sue, Quinet? This assertion is so fully borne out by fact, that nobody, we feel confident, will deny it. But another point seems to us quite as incontrovertible, namely, that at the time when the spirit of infidelity spread over the length and breadth of the kingdom, there was no other individual or set of individuals, except the Romish Church, that had the right of propounding opinions on matters of religious, political, or social interest. No; heresy had been effectually suppressed, and the voice of truth no longer sounded, either in the fastnesses of the Cevennes, or behind the walls of Port Royal. Such being the case it cannot be said that Voltaire and his friends, the *encyclopædists*, had learned deism at the *prêches* of Cherenton; it was not a Calvinist minister who dictated to Diderot his obscene tales; it was not the pastor of one of the Churches in the wilderness who infected Crébillon and d'Alembert. Alas! priests, *abbés*, bishops, princes of the Church, encouraged Voltaire to "crush the wretch;" an *abbé* wrote the "*Histoire Philosophique des deux Indes*;" an *abbé* wrote "*Manon Lescaut*;" an *abbé* reduced metaphysics to sensualism; an *abbé* was the Duke d'Orléans' prime minister and the chief associate of all his debaucheries. It is no paradox to affirm that the saturnalia of the Reign of Terror sprang from the Vatican itself, and that we are indebted to the pope for the cap of "Red Republicanism."

The reign of Napoleon, in restoring French society to something like order and outward decency, did not bring back at once the blessings of true religion; it requires more than a few years to destroy the effects produced by such an outpouring of infidelity as that which took place in the last century. As a matter of course, it follows that when constitutional governments and comparative liberty of the press became, in 1815, the order of the day, instead of publicists, legislators and orators ready to maintain from the gospel standpoint the true principles of liberty, France exhibited the spectacle

of an Ultramontane minority struggling for power against an opposition made up of Voltairians, Utilitarians, Socialists, neo-Christians, Saint Simonians, etc., etc. The absence of right principles soon tells upon the state of popular literature; during the lapse of time comprised between 1815 and 1848 the periodical press in France has constantly been sinking lower and lower until we have seen it—and rather rejoiced at the sight—almost swept away under the stringent decrees of the present imperial government. And no wonder it should be so when we find Eugene Sue worshipped as a demi-god, and rational beings taking their cue from George Sand.

We do not blame Cardinal Wiseman for pointing out the necessity of reforming the cheap literature of the day; all that we maintain is, that the party he represents is not capable of carrying out that reform. What will they substitute instead? What intellectual food have they to offer to the new generation? The works of Alphonso Ligorio, extracts from the Bollandists, or pseudo-historical treatises in which the truth is sacrificed to the interests of Jesuitism. With such trash set before them, it would be somewhat astonishing if a nation still ignorant of gospel truths did not rush to the other extreme and adopt thoroughly infidel principles. There is no doubt that news-venders and cheap booksellers, both in England and in America, are supplying daily cart-loads of garbage to the mechanics and labourers of our large towns; but then, on the other hand, the antidote circulates quite as freely by the care of Bible and tract societies; and we feel convinced that the influence and spread of evangelical religion alone have preserved the nations of Anglo-Saxon origin from those revolutionary upheavings which seem likely to end in the absolute dissolution of the political societies belonging to the great Latin family.

The question of morality is closely connected with that of intellectual development. Every one has heard of M. de Bonald's celebrated axiom, that literature is the expression of society; we believe this is quite true, and certainly, judging matters from that standpoint, we must acknowledge with M. Roussel that Roman Catholicism is not more favourable to morality than to mental culture.

"Our moral corruption manifests itself under two principal aspects: violent crimes and shameful vices, assassinations and loose morals. One word on each of these two points. Many causes influence the judges in their decisions; therefore we shall reckon not only crimes actually perpetrated, but those which have been merely attempted. The first class alone give the measure of the severity of human laws; combined with the second, they show better the perversity of man. M. de Jonnès then brings before us the following results:—

MURDERS AND ATTEMPTS TO MURDER IN EUROPE.

Scotland,	1835.....	1 for every 270,000
England.....	" 178,000
The Netherlands, 1824.....	" 163,000
Prussia,	1826.....	" 100,000
Austria,	1809.....	" 57,000
Spain,	1826.....	" 4,113
Naples.....	" 2,750
States of the Church.....	" 750

"In this gradually decreasing scale of morality, the first four states are Protestant, the last four Catholic. In order to get a more correct measure, let us take the average, and we have for the whole of the above-named Protestant nations one murder or attempt to murder for every 180,222; while in the Catholic countries we find one murder or attempt to murder for every 16,153. In other terms, the ratio of crimes among the Roman Catholics, compared with Protestants, is eleven to one.

"We now go on to the second point, to morals, properly so called, which we appreciate by their deficiency, not by their perfection. We acknowledge that illegitimate births are not a very sure test of the immorality of a nation: in one country legal marriages are attended by so many difficulties that the sanction of the law is not generally sought; elsewhere public opinion admits that a wife may countenance a lover's addresses without any disparagement to her husband, thus legalizing immorality and transforming impurity into adulterous intercourse; prostitution, in a third instance, effaces the origin of illegitimate unions. These three cases offer remedies far worse than the evil. But as we do not pretend to supply our readers with perfectly exact appreciations in subjects of this description, we shall merely quote from the data furnished by statistical accounts."—Vol. i, pp. 18–20.

M. Roussel then takes an average from a series of numbers, as he has done already in the case of violent crimes, and he finds that there are twice as many natural children born among Roman Catholic communities as in Protestant nations. One fact, to which we shall now allude, very easily accounts for the great excess of crime and the uncommon laxity of morals noticeable wherever the religion of the pope reigns supreme:—

"When crimes can be compounded for, a criminal is seldom deterred from committing them. The Italian robber, the Spanish prostitute, satisfy the claims of conscience by dividing their profits with the Virgin Mary. We find in history that more than one murderer has taken the holy communion as a preparation for the crime he was about to perpetrate. Something similar occurs in the case of suicides. M. de Guerry gives us a long list of instances in which that crime has been committed under the safeguard of the Roman Catholic religion. Sometimes it is a man who hangs himself in asking God's pardon; or a woman, on the point of taking poison, begs that masses may be said for the good of her soul. On other occasions, the self-murderer has provided himself with amulets and small prints which reveal the state of his thoughts. The greater number ground their hopes of heaven on the fact that they have suffered here below; they present as an expiatory offering the apparent sacrifice of their life, in conformity with the Roman Catholic doctrine, that he who suffers may offer his troubles as a pleasing oblation to God. But the learned statistician must speak for himself:—'Many persons will, no doubt,

be astonished at this manifestation of religious feelings, at the very moment when the individual who expresses them is on the point of committing a deed which religion condemns as a crime. Yet similar discrepancies are more common than one might suppose. Several suicides cross themselves before hurrying into eternity; others kneel down and say their prayers; on a few are to be found rosaries and devotional books.

"Can one case be quoted in which a Protestant has justified from the Bible an attempt on his own life?"—Vol. ii, pp. 368, 369.

The low state of morality which renders Catholic nations so unfortunately conspicuous must, in due time, tell upon the whole life, both political and intellectual, of the people. We have seen, with M. Roussel, that the popish misrepresentation of the great doctrine of atonement necessarily encourages crime. When an error such as this is adopted by a nation gifted with a highly imaginative and poetic temperament, we can state at once what direction it will give to literature. We shall have the novelist and the dramatic writer selecting for the leading idea of their compositions the glaring paradox that love, as a cleansing baptism, washes away all the stains of the most polluted life. We shall have characters borrowed from the annals of the jail, and novelists finding fault with Protestant ladies, because, though "they may be chaste, pure, virtuous, *yet their unexpansive love is always calm and orderly, as proceeding from a consciousness of fulfilled duty.*"

Time will not allow us to follow M. Roussel through every successive chapter of his interesting work; we can only add, that he has brought together with great industry and care all the data necessary to help the reader in the solution of that important problem, What are the destinies of Protestantism—what are those of Roman Catholicism? Is it God, who, after all, must reign supreme over the conscience of man, or is it the priest?

But there is one point which we feel the need of insisting upon still further, in connexion with our subject, viz., that the different elements which compose true civilization are closely linked together, and are never found apart from one another. Wherever true religion is, there you may depend upon meeting political freedom, physical comfort, all the blessings of industry in the various branches of commerce and agriculture, together with a high state of intellectual development.

What are the laws which bind the moral universe? Knowledge and virtue. The sum of all knowledge is acquaintance with God and his works; and the sum of all virtue, because of all the commandments, is love to God and our neighbour. And as from these all good springs, it follows that whatever country has most of them must be most prosperous, exalted and happy. Now, will any per-

son deny that the great scheme carried on by the Roman Catholic priesthood has been precisely the reverse of the principles we have just now stated? We say with M. Roussel, Look at Ireland as compared with Scotland, look at the United States compared with South America, look at Belgium compared with Holland. We would point more especially to Ireland, because that unfortunate country has been used *ad nauseam* as an argument against Protestant principles and Protestant administration. It is all very well to talk about British misrule; but after having made every allowance for the evil consequences which arise from the juxtaposition on the same soil of the conquerors and the conquered, with all the difference in manners, habits, feelings, which separate the Celtic from the Saxon race,—after all this is freely admitted, we must maintain that the time and attention bestowed since 1800 on Irish affairs by the legislature of Great Britain has more than atoned for any anterior mismanagement or act of oppression. During the last fifty-four years, thirty-three committees of parliament, and twenty-one government commissions have been appointed to inquire into the causes of Ireland's miseries and the best means of their removal; and during the same period the Irish have received £26,000,000 sterling in mere grants and advances;* £1,000,000 have been given to construct harbours for commerce, £8,500,000 to encourage manufactures, £8,000,000 to save the people from the grave of famine; while canals, railways, agriculture, and fisheries, have all been nursed at the public expense. Nay, even Irish charitable institutions are largely supported by parliamentary grants.† Yet, while not a tithe of this kindness has been shown to Scotland, the agitator has for years harped upon British neglect.

Since the events which have marked the year 1848, Roman Catholic writers have taken up another argument against Protestantism, and they have selected it with the tact and dexterity they so generally evidence in their controversial discussions. Socialism is represented by M. Nicolas‡ as the legitimate offspring of Protestant doctrines, and the close relation which exists between Luther and M. Proudhon is now proved to a demonstration. In answer to this calumny, we might point again to Ireland. What have the priests done there, but to spread the spirit of disaffection and rebellion? The fact is, that Romanism can fawn before *le peuple souverain* or bless the iron rule of despots, according to circumstances, and as it seems best to suit its own purposes. No one will credit Dr. Cahill if he tells us that the only object he has for exciting the

* Thorn's Statistics, *passim*.

† Ibid., p. 251.

‡ Du Protestantisme et de toutes les hérésies dans leurs rapports avec le Socialisme.

Irish to agitation is the love of popular freedom. No; what he dreads, what all the Romish hierarchy dreads, is that that very spirit of liberty should spread far and wide, and put an end to their own influence. They are full well aware that as soon as the Irishman gets beyond the reach of the father confessor, it is not long before he flings off all his allegiance to a religion he never really loved. "Those priests," says an English writer,* "who, during the revolution of 1848, with a subtlety altogether worthy of them, appeared foremost in the republican ranks, and were the noisiest of the crowds who shouted 'liberty, equality, fraternity,' were *all the while* quietly waiting the turn of the tide; and so are *now* the avowed leaders of that dreadful conspiracy which is formed against the freedom of Europe."

Really it is too bad of M. Nicolas to speak disparagingly of Socialism, when he can, without much trouble, find in the very ranks of the communion he extols so many agitators, quasi-reformists, and orators, who have endeavoured to bring about an *entente cordiale* between the tenets of Robespierre and the vagaries of the infallible Church.

The fact is, that Roman Catholicism may be compared to a huge body which, nearly overcome by disease, and gasping under the last agonies of death, rallies itself for a while and makes one last and desperate struggle, in which it spends all its energy. In conclusion of M. Roussel's book, our own conclusion is that Romanism has lived its day, and that it is now passing away. The ship which carries the successor of St. Peter and his fortunes appears now only like a crazy barque conveying to certain destruction those infatuated nations who would trust to it for safety. "If we measure," says a celebrated French writer, "the respective progress made since 1814 by Catholic and non-Catholic nations, we must be utterly astounded at the disproportion. England and the United States, both Protestant communities, have assumed on an extraordinary scale the dominion over immense regions already numerous populated, but destined to be still more so at some later period. England is now carrying on the conquest of those vast and thickly inhabited provinces known by the name of India. In America, the same kingdom has spread civilization through the north districts, in the deserts of Upper Canada. The industry of her children has also secured for Great Britain an island, Australia, which is a real continent, and its offshoots may be found in the chief groups with which the ocean is studded. Not only have the United States increased in population and wealth throughout their original territory, they

* Rev. Dr. Dill. *Ireland's Miseries*, &c.

have extended that territory to its utmost limits, and are now bounded on each side by the ocean. San Francisco is another New-York, whose influence will most likely be within a very short space of time quite equal to that of the former great city. The states have made trial of their superiority upon the Catholic nations of the new world, and reduced them to acknowledge a rule which no one now ever calls in question. After the first attempt made by England against China, both that nation and the United States seem destined to submit to their rule the two most renowned empires in the east, China and Japan. In the meanwhile let us see the progress accomplished during the same space of time by the Roman Catholic communities. The first of all, the most compact, the most renowned, France, which fifty years ago appeared at the head of modern civilization, has seen her sceptre broken and her power dispersed amid the most unheard-of disasters. With the noblest courage, with the most unconquerable energy, she has risen from her ruins; but whenever the observer might have thought that she was about to take her flight anew, fate has sent to her, as a scourge from God, some revolution to paralyze her efforts, and to bring her once more to the ground. The balance of power between Catholic and non-Catholic civilization has evidently been displaced since 1789."*

We shall subjoin only one word of comment to this eloquent quotation. M. Michel Chevallier, who wrote it originally, and M. Roussel, who reproduces it, are both Frenchmen, and so appear to be pronouncing the funeral oration of their own country. But it is not so; true patriotism is not inconsistent with evangelical Christianity. France may still, by breaking off the fetters which bind her to Rome, retrieve her former place in the sphere of civilization; and after a serious consideration of the plain truths so industriously put together by M. Roussel, who would hesitate for a moment to pronounce on which side—Protestantism or Catholicism—are to be found the best guarantees toward the permanent happiness of the great human family?

* *Journal des Debats*, September, 1853.

ART. V.—WERE THE TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL EVER LOST?

THE question which we have placed at the head of this article, ought, first of all, to have been answered before any attempt had been made to find the Ten Tribes. The exact point to which we shall direct our inquiry is this, namely:—Were the Ten Tribes of Israel *ever lost* in any sense differing materially from that in which Judah was lost? If not, is there proof that Israel and Judah returned to their own country, together, at the close of the “seventy years’” captivity in Babylon? If an affirmative answer to the last question can be given, by a reasonable exegesis of the Scriptures which afford testimony upon this point, and that testimony evolved by no other rules of interpretation than such as will commend themselves to the common sense of men, then all the theories, whether to account for the loss of the Ten Tribes from history, or their recovery to the general recognizance of the Church, which are built upon the assumption that they *are* lost, must of necessity go for nothing; as also will many cognate notions respecting the Jews. We shall endeavour in the following pages to show that the Ten Tribes of Israel have been recovered from their *eastern dispersion*, and that their subsequent history is identical with that of Judah and Benjamin, both in the Bible and in the general history of society so far as it sketches the life and fortunes of the “chosen people.”

In order to a full understanding of what will hereafter be said in proof of this point, we must briefly recall the facts belonging to the history of the captivity; for as both Israel and Judah were carried away in parts, at different times and to different places, it is possible that embarrassment will arise when we come to certain prophecies which speak of their recovery, seeing that the theatre for the fulfilment of these predictions is the country of Babylon. A careful consideration of the following facts will remove all appearance of difficulty in the exposition of this subject, so far, at least, as it relates to the dispersion. The leading facts of the dispersion of Israel are given in the following passages. In 1 Chron. v, 26, it is said:—“And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, King of Assyria, and the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser, King of Assyria, and he carried them away, even the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan, unto this day.” For an account of the final overthrow of the kingdom of Israel, see 2 Kings xviii, 9–11. Shal-

maneser, after having besieged the capital for a period of three years, reduced it and carried "away Israel, and put them in Halah, and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."

Assyria and Media were, then, the places or countries to which the Ten Tribes were carried. Media at that time was a province of Assyria; but after the death of Sardanapalus, the son and successor of Pul, it was erected into an independent government. With the fall of Sardanapalus terminated the old Assyrian empire, after having subsisted for nearly one thousand five hundred years. Not far from the year B. C. 750, the fragments of this ancient government were reconstructed into three kingdoms, namely:—Babylon, Nineveh, and Media. The history of these three powers runs in parallel lines for about one hundred years, or to the year B. C. 670, when the Assyrians of Babylon and the Assyrians of Nineveh were united under Saosduchinus, the first Nebuchodonosor of the Holy Scriptures. The united kingdoms of Babylon and Nineveh having continued for about half a century were finally resolved into the kingdom of Babylon proper. In the meantime the sovereign power of Media became regal. Arbaces, who at the time of the breaking up of the old Assyrian empire was provincial governor of Media, (and in fact it was he who took the lead in the conspiracy which resulted in the overthrow of Sardanapalus, and the fall of his kingdom,) continued to exercise sovereign authority over the Medes without taking upon himself the title of king. Dejoces, however, did assume it, and caused himself to be declared king of the Medes. Let the reader bear it in mind that according to the explicit language of prophecy, (Jer. li, 11,) Media was to furnish, under God, the deliverance of his chosen people.

For an account of the fall of Judah, see 2 Kings, chapters xxiv and xxv. From the time when the kingdom of Israel was finally destroyed to the period when the house of Judah was carried away there elapsed a period of about one hundred and fifteen years. Jehoiachin fell about the year B. C. 606. At this date commences the seventy years' captivity. Judah was therefore carried to what we have called Babylon proper; for, as is apparent by the dates already given, Nineveh was now included in Babylon. We have been thus particular in placing before our readers these dates, and the political situation of the captive tribes, that they may the more easily understand why Babylon is made so conspicuous in those prophecies in which the deliverance of the Jews is foretold, and, also, that they may see that the indiscriminate decree of Cyrus terminating the captivity of the JEWS, for the reason that the *children of Israel and the children of Judah* were all of them under his

authority, did release the *twelve tribes of Jacob* from their bondage. They had been carried to Babylon, and Media, and, for anything shown to the contrary, they were in these two countries when the former was conquered by the latter. When the time came for their release from captivity *they were all included under one government*, namely, Media, and, immediately afterward, in Medo-Persia, by whose king the great commission of their release was executed. Media, then, could be excepted from the language of prophetic denunciation, as but a small portion of Israel was deported into that country. The largest portion of Israel and the whole of the house of Judah were captives in Babylon. The treasures and sacred vessels of the Lord's house were in Babylon. Those who had committed sacrilege and profaned the temple of the Most High were in Babylon; and here, too, were the lineal progenitors of the promised Messiah. Indeed, it had been declared in the language of prophecy, that those judgments which were to befall Babylon, and by which God's people were to be delivered, were "the vengeance of the Lord, the vengeance of his temple," (Jer. li, 11,) which is a very plain intimation that hereby God would vindicate the honour of his name and temple, which Babylon had despised. Moreover, this guilty land was to be the theatre upon which the Lord would work out the great purposes of his mercy in healing the house of Jacob, which had suffered by disruption at first, and then by hostilities and collisions, carried on mutually, for many generations.

We shall now proceed to cite some of the passages of Scripture which go to show, we think, conclusively, that the promised deliverance from Babylon relates, equally, both to Israel and Judah. We begin with Jer. l, 4, 5: "In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the Lord their God. They shall ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten." A mere glance at this passage will show that it foretells a period when *the children of Israel* and *the children of Judah* should yield up their long-cherished animosity toward each other, and in feelings of mutual reciprocity, heightened, possibly, by corresponding sufferings, should propose perpetual amity, based upon united and solemn promises to serve their God in the spirit of their covenant relations to him. Undeniably, then, it is here predicted that *all* the tribes of Jacob shall be recovered and united. But it will be asked, *When* was this reunion to take place? This is an important question, and it is necessary to a cor-

rect and full understanding of this prophecy that a true answer be given to it. This we think can be done easily; for although the year of the world is not given in which this was to take place, yet circumstantial evidence is afforded by which the period of the fulfilment of this prediction is made as certain and satisfactory as if the date of the year had been given in arithmetical numbers. Jacob's redemption was not to be an isolated event. The unfolding page of revelation upon which this grand consummation is written is filled closely with other striking disclosures—events which, in character and magnitude, would, in a sense, form an era, were to crowd the written history of *those days and that time*. If, then, we can find *the events and their date* to which the context refers, we shall also find the chronology of Israel's and Judah's recovery. What these events were, will be seen in the verses immediately preceding the passages upon which we are now commenting. "The word which the Lord spake against Babylon and the Chaldeans, by Jeremiah the prophet. Declare ye among the nations, and publish, and set up a standard; publish and conceal not: say, Babylon is taken, Bel is confounded, Merodach is broken in pieces, her idols are confounded, her images are broken in pieces. For out of the north there cometh up a nation against her which shall make her land desolate, and none shall dwell therein; they shall remove, they shall depart, both man and beast." In those days, and in that time "shall Israel and Judah unite and come to Zion." Now whatever was the nature of the *visitation* here foretold, thus much is certain, that it concerns the very country in which, and the identical people among whom "the children of Israel and the children of Judah" were then held in captivity. There can be no room to doubt that these words are to be considered as an unmistakable denunciation not only against Babylon the capitol, but also against the whole Chaldean empire. They betoken a ruin so complete that they "shall remove . . . both man and beast," and a judgment so protracted that "her land" shall be "desolate."

"In *those days and in that time*" when "Babylon is taken," when "Bel is confounded," and "Merodach is broken in pieces," when, in a word, the whole Chaldean power shall be subverted, Israel and Judah shall enter into the covenant specified, and return to their own land. The recovery of the captive tribes, synchronizing, as it does, with the fall of the "golden" empire, the same evidence in nature and amount which settles the chronology of the overthrow of Babylon, determines the date of the release of the families of Jacob. And in anticipation of the deliverance which would ensue to the Jews upon the predicted fall of their oppressors, the captives are directed

(ver. 8) to "remove out of the midst of Babylon, and go forth out of the land of the Chaldeans."

We now direct the reader's attention to what is said in verses 17-20 inclusive:—

"Israel is a scattered sheep; the lions have driven him away: first the king of Assyria hath devoured him; and last this Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon hath broken his bones. Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will punish the king of Babylon and his land, as I have punished the king of Assyria. And I will bring Israel again to his habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied upon Mount Ephraim and Gilead. In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found: for I will pardon them whom I reserve."

The evidence in this passage is, if possible, more direct than that furnished in the preceeding quotation. Moreover, it contains several historical allusions which furnish means to identify the persons intended to be favoured by the interposition which is here promised. Here, as in the former citation, the release of Israel is conjoined in time with the punishment of the king of Babylon. But who is meant by *Israel* in the seventeenth verse? Does it mean the ten tribes who were called Israel, or Judah, or does it mean all the descendants of Jacob? Beyond a single doubt it means the latter. And the punishment of the king of Babylon was that by which the kingdom of Chaldea was irretrievably ruined. This is shown by the minute historical allusions employed in the text. The king of Assyria is put in opposition to the king of Babylon, as the first oppressor of Israel. The first oppressor had scattered Israel, nay, he had devoured him, and "last this king of Babylon," who was even more rapacious than the "lion," had broken Israel's "bones." The distinction which is made here between Assyria and Babylon will be comprehended easily, if the reader recalls what has been said already in reference to the place and circumstances of the captivity of the respective parts of the family of Jacob. The ten tribes were carried away before the breaking up of the old Assyrian monarchy, whereas it was the Assyrians of Babylon who enslaved Judah and destroyed the temple at Jerusalem. Now except those Israelites who were in Media, all of the ten tribes were in Babylon, suffering under its power and tyranny. These circumstances clearly show that all the surviving descendants of the patriarch Jacob were included in the promise of restoration to their own land "*in those days and in that time*," when God would punish the king of Babylon as he punished the king of Assyria, which the Lord did by overturning the throne of Belshazzar, as, previously, he had the throne of Sardanapalus. And, besides, when the blessings are named which were to ensue to Israel

upon the occurrence of the revolutions specified, the true historical titles which represent the two branches of the house of Jacob are used, thereby putting it beyond the reach of successful controversy, that the ten tribes, as well as Judah, were to be partners of the promised redemption.

It will not be sufficient, however, that we show that Israel is made co-partner with Judah in the promise of recovery, for some might yet suppose that the prophecies which prove this single point are to have their fulfilment in a future exaltation of the house of Jacob. It becomes necessary, therefore, to show that the prophecies in question had their fulfilment at that particular time which would make the histories of Israel and Judah one since the termination of the seventy years' captivity in Babylon. We have no doubt that this point can be made out, fully, by a just exposition of the proof-texts which relate to this subject. None doubt that, soon after the fall of the Chaldean monarchy, Judah was brought back to his own country. We wish to show that it is just as indubitable that Israel also came home from his dispersion and servitude in the east at one and the same time with Judah. The confidence with which we speak upon this point is grounded in part upon the assumption that what God promised he has fulfilled in every instance where the chronological limitation of the promise has expired. If he promised Judah that at the close of seventy years' servitude in Babylon he would work out a deliverance for him, the specific character of the promise becomes evidence to the *fact* of Judah's emancipation. If this is the logical relation of these texts, it follows inevitably that if Israel is included with Judah in the scope of these promises, that Israel did share the boon of fulfilment with Judah. The following passage from Jer. 1, 33-35, we quote with great confidence upon this point:—

"Thus saith the Lord of hosts; The children of Israel and the children of Judah were oppressed together: and all that took them captives held them fast; they refused to let them go.

"Their Redeemer is strong; the Lord of hosts is his name: he shall thoroughly plead their cause, that he may give rest to the land, and disquiet the inhabitants of Babylon.

"A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon her princes, and upon her wise men."

We think there can be no question raised respecting the *place* in which this *common oppression* was endured, for the word "together" designates the *place* as well as the *time* of their sufferings. Where, but in Babylon, could they have been "oppressed together," either in respect to geographical position, or synchronical time, so as to have made it historically possible that their redemption should have been

as coincident in time as had been their place of oppression? Now, unless it can be shown that Judah suffered a *second* oppression in Babylon, it could not have been possible in the nature of things that Israel and Judah could have participated in a common release, unless Israel did actually partake of that which we know that Judah did obtain at the close of the "seventy years" specified in the language of prophecy. So far, then, as this text affords proof that Judah was redeemed from Babylon, it is proof that Israel did also obtain release from the clutches of his Chaldean oppressor. For none can deny that in the text both Israel and Judah are represented as having received the same treatment, as well in their deliverance as in their oppressions. That the fulfillment of this prophecy is limited to the period in history already alluded to, is proved by the fact that at that time Babylon "fell to rise to more." As a government it was utterly overthrown; it has never since revived. Everything, therefore, which would blend with the history of Babylon, must have occurred antecedent to the period about which we are writing, as thereafter she had no history to be written.

The time of this deliverance is therefore settled by indisputable historical evidence.

Let the reader note well the corroborative evidence of the following texts:—

"It shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations." Jer. xxv, 12.

"I will punish the king of Babylon and I will bring Israel again to his habitation the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found: for I will pardon them whom I reserve." Jer. i, 18-20.

If the period from which the *seventy years* date was B. C. 606, as is commonly supposed, then the captivity would *end* about B. C. 536, which is the date of Belshazzar's fall. The reader is requested to notice that Judah's recovery is connected, in date, with the punishment of the king of Babylon, which took place B. C. 536. Now, it is the recovery of Judah at that particular time to which the promises in the foregoing texts relate. But the name of Israel is coupled with that of Judah in the promises of deliverance at the time when God would "punish the king of Babylon." It will follow, therefore, as an uncontrollable, logical necessity, that the ten tribes of Israel were to be joint-heirs of the promised redemption. So far, then, as relates to the time in which these predictions were to be fulfilled, the evidence in the texts quoted is so full and direct that no logical advantage would ensue from the multiplication of parallel passages. We shall, therefore, pass on to the consideration of another class of

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. VII.—27

scriptures in which other branches of the general argument are unfolded.

It will be remembered that in the course of the prophetic revelations made concerning Judah's recovery from Babylon, the human agent of their release is announced by name. What we wish to show by the following quotations is, that *that particular release from foreign servitude, which Judah obtained through the clemency of CYRUS, was also enjoyed by Israel or the ten tribes.*

In Jeremiah li, 11, it is very plainly, but in general terms, announced that the overthrow of Babylon would be by the hand of the Medes. But Isaiah, in chapter xliii, is very direct and minute in proof upon this point. In verse 1, Jacob and Israel are addressed, the Lord saying to them, "Fear not, for I have redeemed thee;" and in verses five to seven inclusive, the Lord promises to bring their "seed from the east and gather them from the west." He says, "I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth. Every one that is called by my name; for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him, yea, I have made him."

But what does this gathering of "every one" of Jacob and Israel mean? And when was it to take place? These questions are in part answered by what is said in the fourteenth verse: "Thus saith the Lord, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chaldeans whose cry is in the ships." By whom did God send to dash in pieces the "golden cup?" The answer is given Isaiah xlv, 1-4, in the following testimony:—

"Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. For Jacob, my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me."

There can be no doubt, we think, that in this prediction we have a clear preannouncement of the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus. Nor is there reason to suppose that the text was to have any other than a plain historical fulfilment. What is here said respecting Cyrus as the conqueror of Babylon will be seen not to conflict with Daniel v, 31, where it is said that "Darius the Mede took the kingdom," if the following facts be well considered. Darius the Mede is the same as Cyaxares II., of profane history. Cyrus was the son

of Astyages, the third king of Media. He succeeded his father in government, and reigned for a period of thirty-five years. Mandane, the sister of Darius, had been given in marriage by his father to Cambyses, the king of Persia. Cyrus was the issue of this marriage, and was but one year the junior of his uncle Darius. Darius, therefore, as king of the nation by whom Babylon was subverted, may very well be spoken of as the conqueror, while Cyrus, as the acting leader of the conquering army, may have been, in a very special sense, "the rod of the Almighty," chosen to chastise the oppressors of his people.

In the citations now before the reader, there is an historical relation subsisting between the several points, revealed and promised, which clearly shows that this great gathering of the "seed of Jacob, (Isa. xliii, 5-7,) was to ensue upon the elevation and success of Cyrus, whom God had designated to be the deliverer of his oppressed people. But then it must be remembered that this was the gathering of *Jacob*, the redemption of *Israel*. The designations here employed, are never, so far as we now know, applied to Judah exclusively, especially when used in a plain historical sense. The conclusion is, therefore, unavoidable, that the ten tribes were included in the common redemption from bondage wrought out for Jacob by the hand of Cyrus.

Before closing the book of Isaiah we will direct the attention of the reader to the forty-eighth chapter, which gives concurrent testimony to the point under consideration. In the first verse is the following address: "Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, which are called by the name of Israel, and are come forth out of the waters of Judah, which swear by the name of the Lord, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth nor in righteousness." Following this address is a sketch of their obstinacy and errors, from which they were to be refined by their afflictions in Babylon. This finished, they are called upon in the twentieth verse—"Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the end of the earth; say ye, The Lord hath redeemed his servant Jacob." The *time* of this redemption is shown by the fourteenth verse; it was to be realized when God should "*do his pleasure on Babylon*." But who are they that are to "go forth of Babylon," and who are to "flee from Chaldea?" We answer, they are the same persons who in the first verse are called Jacob, alias Israel, *who came forth of the waters of Judah*. It only remains to show that the persons addressed in the first verse are the ten tribes of Israel, and then it will have been proved that they were recovered with Judah. The

true historical application of this passage very much depends upon the meaning of the metaphor of *water* here used to make out the description of the persons intended to be favoured by the interposition promised. There is a parallel use of this word in Rev. xvii, 15, where it is said, "the waters which thou sawest . . . are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Here the word is used metaphorically to signify communities of persons, or persons in a collective sense. We see no ground to doubt that it is used in the same sense in the text under discussion. The description, therefore, refers to that portion of the family of Jacob who were called *Israel*, but specifically those *who came forth out of the waters of Judah*; that is, that branch of Jacob who separated themselves in a collective and governmental sense from Judah. These, surely, were the "ten tribes." At the time appointed *they* were to go out of Babylon, and flee from Chaldea. But how or when could they escape from their oppression, if it were not jointly with Judah? for the Medes were to make "Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, and the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, . . . as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah." Isa. xiii, 19. The Lord had declared that he would "sweep" Babylon "with the besom of destruction;" that he would "cut off the name, and remnant, and son and nephew," from that land. And these denunciations have been so literally fulfilled, that had not Israel fled away he must have been annihilated with his doomed captor. Here then is positive evidence that the ten tribes of Israel were to be joint partakers with Judah of that deliverance from Babylon which would ensue upon the fall of that proud and powerful kingdom.

Having now shown the place of their captivity, the *time* and visible *agent* of their release—both of Israel and Judah—we shall proceed to examine some predictions, which, while they yield additional proof to the points already established, will exhibit other important views in the history of this general subject. And we desire the reader, as we proceed in this brief exegesis of texts, to note the accumulation of evidence, that the *subject-matter of these prophecies is purely historical*. This fact will be used hereafter, not only to justify the construction put upon these particular texts, but, also, as showing necessarily the truth of our main position.

In Jeremiah xxxiii, 7, 8, we have a strong point of evidence upon our main doctrine. Here it is said:—

"And I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and I will build them, as at the first.

"And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me."

The captivity from which they were to return is shown, by verses 4 and 5, to be that which they were to endure in Chaldea for their sins and transgressions. But what is meant by the promises, "*will build them as at the first?*" And what proof does this afford, if any, that the ten tribes returned with Judah to the Holy Land? These questions are easily and satisfactorily answered. Many years before Jeremiah came into the prophetic scene, God had said by the mouth of Hosea (chap. i, 4)—"I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, and will cause to CEASE the KINGDOM of the house of Israel." This subversion took place when the house of Israel was carried away into the land of Assyria. From that day forth it never has existed as a *separate government*.

But, accompanying the prediction of their overthrow, is a promise of their recovery. A leading characteristic circumstance connected with their redemption is, that it was to be in connexion with Judah's restoration, and both henceforth were to be consolidated in *one* civil power. This is clearly the testimony in Hosea i, 11, where it is said, "Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of Jezreel."

Here, then, it is shown, that to "build them as at the first" meant to *reconstruct* them into one government as they had existed in the days of David and Solomon. We have seen that the *government* of "the house of Israel" was broken up by the Assyrians—that as a separate kingdom it has never since existed. But the Lord promised that he would "cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and" would "build them as at the first." Here, then, we press the question, Did the Lord cause the captivity of Judah to return? Did he not, then, also cause the captivity of Israel to return? He did "cause to cease the *kingdom* of the house of Israel." Did not the Lord then also "build them as at the first?" We confess that we are unable to conjecture any reasonable ground for a negative answer to the implied conclusions to which these interrogatives lead. Indeed, the whole chapter (Jer. xxxiii) from which we are quoting is replete with evidence of the return of Israel with Judah to their own country, and of their joint-possession of their former inheritance. A few citations, however, must suffice. Verses 13 and 14:—

"In the cities of the mountains, in the cities of the vale, and in the cities of the south, and in the land of Benjamin, and in the places about Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, shall the flocks pass again under the hands of him that telleth them, saith the Lord. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah."

Again, verses 23-26 :—

“Moreover the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying, Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, The two families which the Lord hath chosen, he hath even cast them off? thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them.

“Thus saith the Lord; If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them.”

Now, when it is remembered that it was their enemies, even they who now held them in bondage, that tauntingly said, “The two families which the Lord hath chosen, he hath even cast them off,” it will be easily seen that a construction is to be put upon the passage which will make God’s reply to them a rebuke to their pride and assumption, and at the same time a promise to the “seed of Jacob” of release from the grasp of the ambitious and sneering Chaldean. To deny this would be to deprive the text of its significance. The context, as all may see, requires that an application be allowed to the passage under discussion, which makes it yield direct and positive proof that Israel did return with Judah from Babylon to their own inheritance.

We now proceed to notice a few passages in the Book of Ezekiel. This prophet, it will be remembered, was one of the captives in Babylon. We mention this fact, in this connexion, merely to show that there is no chronological necessity to look below the *termination* of the captivity in Babylon to find the historical matter of those predictions which speak of the *recovery* and *reunion* of *all* the tribes of Israel. Now, unless there are solid reasons for referring them to a period subsequent to the one in question,—and they must be reasons founded in the terms employed, or in the general scope of the subject,—then we can see no just ground to doubt that these predictions were fulfilled at the time and in the manner which we have shown that corresponding prophecies have had their fulfilment, uttered by Isaiah and Jeremiah, who were contemporaries with Ezekiel. Indeed, in our judgment, a large portion of the prophecy of Ezekiel is occupied with the subject of Jacob’s redemption from Babylon. It is not necessary to cite all the passages which it contains bearing upon the point under discussion. We intend little more than to indicate the nature of the testimony which abounds in this prophetic book.

We begin with chapter xvi, verse 53 :—

“When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them.”

Jerusalem, on account of her great wickedness, is here called Sodom; and Samaria, for a corresponding reason, is styled her sister. These two cities were respectively the seats of government of Judah and Israel; and consequently, by a figure of speech, they are put for the people which were represented in them. When the prophet announced their *common release*, they both were in captivity in Babylon. Now, unless this prophecy was fulfilled by the return of both branches of the house of Jacob from Babylon, during the time of Cyrus, we confess to an inability to see how it can be fulfilled at all, inasmuch as it is undeniable that at that time "Sodom and her daughters" were brought back; but if "Samaria and her daughters" were left, then, by the nature of the case, there could be no *community* in the boon announced, and this is the characteristic point shown by the passage.

We pass to the consideration of evidence upon our main point, contained in the thirty-seventh chapter of this prophecy. And as it would occupy a larger space than can be allowed to it in this brief discussion, to quote all that is necessary to a perfect understanding of the view which we wish to place before our readers, we must beg them to verify for themselves several things which we shall assume as true in our exposition. We shall, however, give a very brief analysis of several chapters preceding the one to which we have specially alluded, as thereby the reader will more easily comprehend the evidence we adduce from it in favour of our main subject.

Our purpose will be answered by commencing with chapter xxiii, in which the idolatries of Israel and Judah are portrayed by the metaphor of two lewd women, (1-21.) Following this description of their character, is a denunciation of severe judgment against them, (22-49.) In chapter xxiv, 1-14, Jerusalem is particularized by the enormity of her crimes, and the severity of her punishment under the figure of a boiling pot; but it was a reward so well merited that the prophet is forbidden to "weep" or "mourn" for his dead, (15-27.) In chapter xxv, it is announced that God, in turn, would punish the enemies of Israel; and in chapter xxix, verse 21, after having foretold the overthrow of Egypt by Nebuchadrezzar, it is said, "In that day will I cause the horn of Israel to bud forth," which showed the incipient working of a system of means by which God would accomplish their emancipation, as it is described in chapter xxxvi.

We now ask the reader's attention to the subject-matter of the thirty-seventh chapter. Here is contained the famous vision of "a valley full of bones," (verse 1.) While the prophet was gazing, mournfully, upon the symbolical remains of a once great and prosperous

people, the Lord asks him if these bones can live, (verse 3,) and then commands him to prophesy unto these bones, and say unto them, "O ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord," (verse 4.) Now, although it has been thought by some expositors that this vision related to something in intimate connexion with the dispensation of the gospel, and the future restoration of the Jews under its ministrations, and by others to be a prophetic representation of the final resurrection, we are of the opinion that it had its complete realization in the political revivification of the house of Jacob. Indeed, if respect is to be had to the exposition of the vision which God gave to the prophet at the very time when he was favoured with this insight into the future, its application thereby must be deemed to have been settled. We, therefore, feel safe in submitting our judgment to the evidence in the case.

In verse 11 God told the prophet that "*these bones are the WHOLE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.*" But the question will at once arise, What is intended by the resurrection of these bones? The answer is at hand in verses 12, 13, and 14, and is in the following language, namely:—

"Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel.

"And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves.

"And shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall *place* you in *your own land*: then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord."

By a proper attention to the facts relating to the history of the house of Israel at the time when this prediction was uttered, and also to the explicitness of the language employed in the exposition of the vision itself, an easy and natural sense of the passage can be gained.

The "whole house of Israel" was in captivity at the time when the prophet saw that "valley of bones." About twenty of the seventy years of the period for which they were doomed had already past away. The sufferers had said, (verse 11,) "Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts." The muscles and sinews of the tribes had been torn asunder, and devoured by a rapacious enemy. In order, therefore, to prevent utter despair throughout the house of Jacob, God directed the prophet to say to them that *these dry bones should live*; that he would cause their graves to be opened, and would bring them up out of their graves, and cause them to come into their own land again. *These dry bones, then, were the skeletons* of the tribes of Jacob. They were stripped

of every social and political function by their heathen conquerors. Their *grave* was Babylon, where now were buried their national franchises and honour; in a word, all that they held dear in the institutions of their fathers and of their God. The resurrection promised, then, was the reinstatement of the nation in the land of Israel. This, we believe, to be the only true sense of this remarkable passage. Now, if we are correct in this opinion, and shall be able to show that the phrase, "the whole house of Israel," includes the ten tribes, then the passage becomes positive proof of the return of all the tribes, and of their reunion in government and the social state at the close of "the seventy years' captivity."

The phrase itself, if it be considered in its relation to the subject to which it is applied, were it not that traditive prepossessions often influence the judgment, would be deemed proof that the application which we have given it is just and true, although no exegetical testimony were at hand to support it. But we are happy to say that the construction now given it is most amply and satisfactorily corroborated by evidence which precludes a doubt as to its import in the connexion in which it occurs. This is furnished in verses fifteen to twenty-second inclusive:—

"The word of the Lord came again unto me, saying, Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions:

"And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thy hand.

"And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not show us what thou meanest by these?

"Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in my hand.

"And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thy hand before their eyes.

"And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land:

"And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."

It is not necessary to multiply words upon a passage so direct and full in its evidence of the truth of the doctrine now under consideration. The vision of the resurrection of the "dry bones" is then direct and positive proof, as far as the foretelling of an event can be evidence that the event has taken place, that the whole *house of Israel* were recovered from their dispersion in Assyria and Babylon, and restored to their own land by Cyrus, according to the divine promise. And now the evidence of our position becomes

cumulative; for having declared his purpose to restore the *whole* "house of Israel," the Lord proceeds to show by what steps this great event was to be brought about. (See chapters xxxviii and xxxix.) In the latter chapter, in verses 25, 26, God renews his promise to restore the whole "house of Israel;" and in anticipation of their coming to dwell in their land, full directions are given for the rebuilding of the temple, and the celebration of its holy services; and the book is concluded, beginning at the thirteenth verse of chapter xlvi, with directions for a repartition of the land to the *twelve tribes by name*.

Our readers cannot have failed to notice one characteristic of all the scriptures which we have quoted, namely, that Israel and Judah are constantly united in the promise of redemption from Babylon. And those selected are from a class of promises which none can doubt were fulfilled in relation to Judah, under Cyrus. But why should we question their fulfillment, also, in relation to Israel? It may be replied that the return of Judah is a matter of written history, and, therefore, all doubt in respect to it is precluded; whereas no such testimony exists in relation to Israel, consequently it is reasonable to suppose that they never returned from their dispersion in the east. Were this assumption true, it would be a formidable difficulty in the way of our conclusion. We have foreseen that with many candid minds, who will readily allow the fairness and legitimacy of our exposition of the proof-texts, it will be felt that a link is wanting, in direct and positive historical testimony, in order to connect the exposition with the doctrine that hereby the argument may be completed.

We cheerfully admit that it would be an anomaly if Israel did return from Babylon that no mention is made of that fact, since Judah is so repeatedly spoken of in the even partial history of that people subsequent to the building of the second temple. This apparent silence in relation to Israel need, however, occasion no surprise, for, from the day that Samaria fell by the hand of the Assyrian conqueror, *the kingdom of the house of Israel* CEASED TO EXIST. The last scene of its history was exhibited in the tragedy of its explosion. Like the ship upon the ocean, when her magazine is fired, as soon as the first shock of ruin is past, she disappears from the face of the waters. The mission of that kingdom had been fulfilled. God had punished the pride and disobedience of Solomon. (1 Kings xi, 9-13; xii, 15.) Moreover, Israel in turn had become corrupt, and God had denounced the kingdom, (Hos. i, 4,) and the denunciation had been terribly fulfilled in the overthrow of the government and the captivity of the people. This was a *final destruction of*

their governmental character. The page of history which they had been accustomed to occupy became a blank, for the sufficient reason that all national functions having become extinct, there was no action to be recorded.

There is another fact which will greatly aid us in accounting for this seeming silence respecting the history of the "ten tribes." And, moreover, it is a fact which will serve to conduct us to the positive historical evidence which is so great a desideratum in completing our argument upon this subject. To fully comprehend it, it is necessary that we carefully notice the Bible use of the various *appellations* given to the Jews, as a nation, and their application when employed to represent the respective branches into which the Jews were divided during the successive periods embraced in their history. By overlooking this important circumstance the reader may be easily misled, or at least confused, in his knowledge of the subject.

Before the disruption of the nation, under the administration of the successor of Solomon, their common title was Israel, the name of the father of the tribes, or Jacob. Subsequent to the rebellion this name was appropriated to the ten tribes, because, it may be presumed, they formed the larger portion of the descendants of these good and reverend men. During their separate national existence, the ten tribes are also called Samaria, Ephraim, and Joseph. These latter titles arose, it is likely, from the following circumstances:—Samaria, the metropolis of Israel, was situated in the portion of Ephraim, who was the son of Joseph. While the division of the nation continued, the tribes of Judah and Benjamin were denominated Judah, because that was the regal family. They were also called the "house of David," because from David descended the legitimate line of kings. At other times they were called Jerusalem and Zion, for the former was the capital of the kingdom, and embraced within its precincts Mount Sion. But subsequently to the close of "the seventy years' captivity," the names Judah and Israel are applied to all Jews indifferently, irrespective of any previous use of them as employed to distinguish the two branches of the nation, as before stated.* This latter fact is capable, when duly considered, of lending important aid in clearing up several things in relation to the history of the ten tribes, and also of assisting us to identify the actual evidence of their return, which is to be found in the historical records of the nation made subsequently to the return of the Jews from Babylon. Abundant proof and illustration of these points exist in the books of Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi, and also in the histories of Ezra and Nehemiah, all of whom wrote

* See Horne's *Int.*, vol. i, p. 388.

after the expiration of the "seventy years." But what do Ezra and Nehemiah say upon the general question? Do they, or either of them, say anything bearing upon the point now under discussion? If they do, all will allow that their testimony, if relevant to the case, must be competent to settle the question. But, then, it must not be forgotten that absolute silence on this point would not prove that the "ten tribes" did *not* return to their country; for, as *Israel*, they had no character to figure upon the page of history; and, besides, from the time that the divine promise was fulfilled in making them *ONE again*, the same title, whatever it be that is employed, comprises the whole nation.

Let us now turn to these books, and examine the testimony which they give upon the points in question. In Ezra vi, 16, are the following words:—"And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of this house of God with joy?" (See also verses 21, 22.) Now, here occur the old-established designations of the nation which were used previous to their division. *The children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites*, comprehended all the distinctions among them which were founded upon the law; and, except for some particular reason, the people were never otherwise entitled than *Israel*, or the *children of Israel*. It follows, then, unavoidably, that Ezra uses the term *Israel* to represent all the descendants of Jacob, or else to mean the *ten tribes*, so that, in either case, the proof of their return is clear and conclusive. (See also chapters iii, 1; ix, 1; x, 1 and 25.)

Nor is the testimony of Nehemiah less conclusive. One passage we quote from chapter i, verse 6:—"Let thine ear now be attentive, and thine eyes open, that thou mayest hear the prayer of thy servant which I pray before thee now, day and night, for the children of Israel thy servants, and confess the sins of the children of Israel, which we have sinned against thee: both I and my father's house have sinned." In chapter x, 39, Nehemiah makes the same distinctions which were made by Ezra. See Neh. ix, 1, 2; xi, 3; and xiii, 3; also Bishop Patrick's note on Ezra vi, 16.

We pass to 1 Chron. ix, 2, 3:—"Now the first inhabitants that dwelt in their possessions in their cities were, the Israelites, the priests, Levites, and the Nethinims. And in Jerusalem dwelt of the children of Judah, and of the children of Benjamin, and of the children of Ephraim, and Manasseh." Upon the second verse as above quoted, Dr. A. Clarke has the following note:—

"This is spoken of those who returned from the Babylonish captivity, and of the time in which they returned; for it is insinuated here that *other persons afterward* settled at Jerusalem, though these mentioned here were the

first on the return from captivity. Properly speaking the *whole* of the Israelitish people, who were, ever since the days of Joshua, divided into the *four* following classes:—1. The *priests*. 2. The *Levites*. 3. The *common people* or *simple Israelites*. 4. The *Nethinims* or *slaves of the temple*."

In confirmation of our method of proof, we will add Mr. Benson's note upon the same text:—

"The common people of Judah and Israel, called here by the general name of Israelites, which was given them before that unhappy division of the kingdoms; and now is restored to them when the Israelites are united with the Jews in one and the same commonwealth, that so all the names and signs of their former divisions might be blotted out."

We do not wish to insinuate that either Dr. Clarke or Mr. Benson believed that the "ten tribes" returned with Judah. The latter we know did not; nor have we any good reasons for thinking that the former did. And yet it ought not to be thought impertinent in us if we do *inquire* how Judah and Israel could be united in *one and the same commonwealth*, as Mr. Benson affirms them to have been after the captivity, if the *latter* did not return with the *former* from their dispersion? Nor are we able to see how the disbelief of these eminent commentators in the point of doctrine which we are attempting to establish can lessen the value of the incidental proof which their exposition of an important fact gives to the proposition under discussion. They respectively confirm what we have said in reference to the use of the terms Israel and Israelites. Nor could they have done otherwise without palpably disregarding the testimony of the third verse that the children of Ephraim and Manasseh dwelt in Jerusalem. But all know that *these* were *two* of the ten tribes. And how could they have dwelt with Judah if they did not return with him? It may be answered that "a few of the Israelites, availing themselves of the decree of Cyrus, did return, but that the great body of them remained in the countries to which they had been carried." We reply, that it is much easier to assert this than it would be to prove it, except by Josephus. And however we might be disposed to yield our assent to the testimony of this historian in ordinary cases, yet when the truth lies between him and such witnesses as the inspired prophets, we must believe the latter whatever becomes of the opinions of the former. God has said by the mouth of Isaiah, (xliii, 5-7,) "*I will bring every one that is called by my name from the east, west, north and south, even from the ends of the earth.*" Now if there are any *exceptions* in the case they must be on the other side of the question. The rule is that they came back; the exception, (if any,) that they remained. This is so, we mean, if it is *safe* to conclude that God fulfilled his promise.

A few references to New Testament authorities shall conclude

our discussion, for the present, of this subject. We intend little more than to cite a few texts in confirmation of the preceding facts and reasonings employed to support our main position. The few selected are so clearly relevant to the point, and, withal, so obviously conclusive, that, in our judgment, more numerous selections would be superfluous. We begin with Acts xxvi, 7: "Unto which promise our TWELVE TRIBES, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." Here is, undeniably, a plain recognition of the whole house of Jacob. Then they were not lost. And if the apostle knew that they were not lost, which he must have known, if he could justify himself for what he asserts, he also knew where they were at that time. The common sense of men in general would, by this allusion, locate them in the land which God had given to their fathers.

Again, the General Epistle of James bears the following significant dedication:—Chap. i, ver. i, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the *twelve tribes* which are scattered abroad, greeting." The style of address through the epistle, the particularity with which he portrays the conduct of some, followed by appropriate admonition and warning, all contribute to show that St. James had a particular knowledge of the personal character of those whom he addressed. But how could he have possessed the information by which his epistle was dictated if he had no opportunity either by personal observation, or through the observation of some co-labourer, both of which would have been precluded if the twelve tribes did not then exist within the circle of apostolical administration. The text, then, must be allowed as direct proof that the twelve tribes were numbered among the immediate objects of apostolic labour and solicitude; or, (which would be a great absurdity,) it must be confessed that this epistle was sent forth at random, and, as a necessary consequence, without any intelligent motive. The first conclusion is by far the most reasonable.

Dr. Macknight has a very singular note upon this passage, which has been quoted by both Dr. Clarke and Mr. Benson. As the case now stands the influence of these great and good men lies against the doctrine of this paper. As Dr. Macknight most assuredly, in this case, has himself been misled, and consequently misguided those who have followed him, we feel fully authorized to apply a corrective to the influence of their error. They all allow the existence of the twelve tribes, but suppose that they were not in their former possessions, and that the ten tribes had not been there since their dispersion in the East. He says:—

"Notwithstanding Cyrus allowed all the Jews in his dominions to return to their own land, many of them did not return. This happened agreeably to

God's purpose in permitting them to be carried captive into Assyria and Babylon; for he intended to make himself known among the heathen by means of the knowledge of his being and perfections, which the Jews in their dispersion would communicate to them. This, also, was the reason that God determined that the ten tribes should never return to their own land. Hos. i, 6; viii, 9; ix, 3, 15-17."

It will be sufficient to quote one of Dr. Macknight's proof-texts in support of the above quotation, and especially the part which is emphatic, for the remaining allusions are only repetitions of the same threatening that is contained in the following language:—"And she conceived again, and bare a daughter. And God said unto him, Call her name Lo-ruhamah: for I will no more have mercy upon the house of Israel; but I will utterly take them away." Hos. i, 6.

Now, had Dr. Macknight consulted Zech. viii, 13-15, he would have been saved from the mistake into which he has fallen, and led others, by the construction which he has put upon the language of Hosea. The Lord had said by the mouth of Zechariah:—

"It shall come to pass, that as ye were a curse among the heathen, O house of Judah, and house of Israel; so will I save you, and ye shall be a blessing: fear not, but let your hands be strong. For thus saith the Lord of hosts: As I thought to punish you, when your fathers provoked me to wrath, saith the Lord of hosts, and I repented not: so again have I thought in these days to do well unto Jerusalem and to the house of Judah: fear ye not."

See also Jer. xxxi, 27-30. A little attention to the chronology of these citations will enable us to put this matter in its true light before the reader. Hosea wrote about B. C. 785, and Zechariah about B. C. 520, or 265 years later than Hosea. It is easy, now, to see the perfect irrelevancy of Dr. Macknight's quotations from Hosea to support the assertion that Israel should never return to his own land. For although God had threatened them with ceaseless expatriation, yet he afterward relaxed and promised them a restoration. He had said by the mouth of Amos, (chap. ix, 10, B. C. 787,) "All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword," yet by the mouth of Zechariah, (chap. x, 6, B. C. 587,) he promised that he would "bring them [the house of Joseph] again to place them, . . . and they shall be as though I had not cast them off." The Israelites who were carried away for their idolatry perished in the captivity, but their children God brought back to the land of their fathers. In this God gave a clear illustration of what he had said by Jeremiah, (xxxii, 29, 30.) The reader can now see that not anything which Hosea had said concerning the extermination of the house of Israel can be employed as proof that the ten tribes did not return from their dispersion, because it is shown by later prophets that the Lord changed his purpose in this respect, and historians record the fact that they did return.

As, then, the "twelve tribes" mentioned in the text under investigation cannot, with any propriety, be taken in the sense in which the commentators before mentioned have applied the designation, we are compelled to the belief that the *scattering* was that which is recorded in Acts viii, 1, and is alluded to again Acts xi, 19. By comparing the date of St. James's epistle with that of the persecution above mentioned, this opinion will be made probable to a degree, little, if any, less than certainty itself. The Epistle of St. James, by Dr. Lardner, Mr. Benson, and others, is supposed to have been written about the year A. D. 61; and the persecution in question took place about the year A. D. 32: so that the "persecution" by which the Christians were scattered abroad "as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch," occurred at least a quarter of a century before the date of the Epistle of James. These facts, the unbiassed reader will see, help to an unconstrained exposition, by which the text yields direct and positive proof that the twelve tribes, in a collective sense, were in the Holy Land, or at least within the knowledge of the apostles in the days of Jesus Christ, and of their own personal ministry.

We have now placed before our readers as much of the argumentative testimony upon this point as we deem necessary at this time. It may not, possibly, induce in their minds the same degree of conviction which it has wrought in our own. Still, however, if it should do no more than lead them to a careful review of their own sentiments upon the question, and thereby make them more familiar with the sacred record, our humble effort will not have been made in vain. And hereby, also, evidence may be evolved by which the faith of the Church shall be settled, and her zeal and efforts on behalf of Israel shall be wisely and efficiently directed for their salvation.

In a subsequent article we intend to exhibit the Bible evidence upon the subject of *Jewish restoration*, in which strong corroborative proof will be given of the justness of our expositions from the prophets which have been cited in this paper.

ART. VI.—ROMAN SLAVERY.

SLAVERY existed among the Romans from the earliest period of their history; yet it was not until their numerous wars had supplied them with hordes of captives, that the system was developed in its worst features.

In the Roman law liberty was defined to be "*naturalis facultas ejus quod cuique facere libet, nisi siquid vi aut jure prohibetur*," that is, the natural ability of doing what one pleases, unless hindered by violence or law. In the same code, slaves are said to be called *servi*, from *servare*, because the conqueror preserves his captives for sale, and does not kill them. For by the laws of war, as it was then carried on, the vanquished forfeited his right to life; hence, if his life was spared, he became the property of his conqueror. But the condition of servitude was always spoken of as contrary to nature. These prisoners of war were sold for the benefit of the public treasury, or reserved as public slaves for the service of the state. This may be considered the common origin of slavery.

Slavery also resulted from the condition of birth. All the children of female slaves were *jure gentium* slaves, and belonged to the master of the mother, whether the father was free or a bondman; the law holding that where there was no *connubium*, that is, lawful wedlock, (and there could be none if either party were a slave,) the child followed the condition of the mother: *partus sequitur matrem*.

Even a freeborn Roman might become a slave; for the debtor who failed to fulfil his obligations was liable to be sold into slavery. The law was, that if the debtor, within a specified period after the debt was proved, failed to satisfy his creditor, he was given over to him as his bondman. Persons who had no property were obliged in borrowing money to give security under the form of a sale of themselves. If they were unable to pay their debts they passed into the hands of their creditors and were exposed to all the hardships of slavery. Many a poor Roman was reduced to slavery from inability to pay his debts, and his wife and children were liable to share his fate.*

The slave among the Romans passed for a human being, yet

* "During the first half of the Samnite war, but in what year is uncertain, there was passed that famous law which prohibited personal slavery for debt; no creditor might for the future attach the person of his debtor, but he might only seize his property."—*Arnold's Rome*, vol. ii., p. 277, (Eng. ed.)

he had no personal rights. The code said, "Quod attinet ad jus civile servi pro nullis habentur, non tamen et jure naturali, quia quod ad jus naturale attinet omnes homines æquales sunt."*—*Digest* i, 19, 32.

The master had the entire right of property in the slave, and could do as he pleased with his person, his powers, his earnings. He could punish, torment, or put him to death at his own will, without being called to account. And this privilege of the master continued down to a late period in the history of Rome, certainly all through the time of the republic. The arbitrary exercise of such unlimited power, which in the early times had been restrained only by the authority of the censors, was gradually checked by positive enactment; first by the Petronian law, which forbade the master to give up his slave to fight with wild beasts without the sentence of a judge. The emperor Claudius also took measures to check the cruelty of masters; but for the first time, under Adrian and afterward under Antoninus Pius, with severer penalties attached, it was enacted that any master who should wilfully put a slave to death, should be just as liable to punishment as if he had taken the life of a person over whom he had no control. A practice which prevailed among the Greeks was also introduced by Antoninus, that if a slave fled to a sanctuary to escape from the cruelty of his master, he could not be brought out by force, but his master was obliged to sell him.

With the earnings of the slave, the Roman law was not as generous as the Greek; for though among the Greeks, slaves were considered merely as property, yet there were many who worked at trades and retained their earnings, after paying their masters a trifling tax. It is true, the Roman slave could acquire a little property, but in the eyes of the law this belonged to the master, and might be retained by him even if the slave should be manumitted.

As the slave was not considered a person, but a thing having no legal rights, every injury done to him concerned only the master; and to the master must satisfaction be given and restitution made. On the other hand, the master was responsible for all offences committed by the slave. He could, however, free himself from the responsibility in cases of private injury, by giving up the slave to the injured party. The punishment of offences against the master was left to be inflicted by himself.

By the Roman law, if a master was found murdered in his house,

* That is, in the view of the civil law, slaves are not accounted persons; yet it is different in the law of nature, for by the law of nature all men are equal.

all his slaves were liable to be put to death. The necessity for so severe a law was argued in the Senate, on the ground that in no other way could the murder of masters be effectually prevented. Every slave would be bound by love for his own life to protect his master's. The first decree of the Senate in reference to this was enacted under Augustus. According to Tacitus, its provisions were made still more stringent under Nero. Tacitus says (*Annals*, 13, 42):—"A decree passed the Senate to protect the lives of masters by the punishment of offending slaves. With this view it was decreed that in case of a master slain by his slaves, not only all actual slaves, but those who had received their freedom and were living under the roof of the deceased at the time of his murder, should be put to death." This law was executed with the utmost rigour in A. D. 61, on the occasion of the prefect of the city being slain by one of his slaves.* According to the strict letter of the law every slave in the family was liable to be put to death; but the people, pitying the fate of so many innocent persons, assembled in crowds to oppose the execution of the law. Then the emperor issued a proclamation, and all the streets leading to the place of execution were lined with soldiers under arms, and the unhappy victims, to the number of four hundred, were put to death.

The general treatment of slaves varied, of course, according to the disposition of the master. From some allusions in the classical writers, we might infer that in the main they were well treated and enjoyed many liberties. But we must bear in mind that these writers are speaking of the *vernæ*, or house slaves, those that had been brought up in the family; or of the educated slaves, who were often of great service to the master, and added much to his income. We read but little in reference to the treatment of the field slaves, who were employed on the large landed estates of the Roman aristocracy. On each of these estates was the *ergastulum*, or jail, in which the slaves were probably locked up for the night, like prisoners in our penitentiaries. The groans from these houses of bondage have not come down to us in the literature of that age, and it is only from an occasional reference that we infer the prevalence of a system of cruelty to the slave far worse than that practised in the cities.

The obedience of slaves was enforced by severe discipline. The rod and the lash were in frequent use; but these were not the most severe instruments of punishment. Burning alive is mentioned in the Pandects; and Tertullian says it was at first only the punishment of slaves. Crucifixion was the fate of the wretched slave,

* Tacitus, *Annals*, 14, 42.

even for a slight misconduct. Thus in Juvenal a cruel mistress is represented as ordering the crucifixion of a slave:—*

“‘Pone crucem servo.’ ‘Meruit quo crimine servus
Supplicium? Quis testis adest? Quis detulit? Audi,
Nulla unquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est.’
‘O demens! ita servus homo est? Nil fecerit, esto,
Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.’”—SAT. vi, 218.

That slaves were barbarously treated in Cicero's time, we infer from some of his orations. Thus, in his oration *Pro Cluentio*, § 66, he says, “*Nam Stratonem quidem, judices, in crucem actum esse exsecta scitote lingua.*”† Cruel masters sometimes hired professional torturers. The opprobrious epithets applied to slaves indicate that they were frequently cruelly treated. Those who had been branded with a hot-iron were termed *stigmatii*, or *literati*. These marks remained visible for life, unless great pains were taken to conceal or remove them. Slaves who became free and rich, tried to hide them with plasters. Martial‡ speaks of a physician who knew how to efface the traces of former branding.

Another cruel punishment was suspending the slave by the hands, with weights attached to the feet, and inflicting blows at the same time. A very common punishment in early times, frequently alluded to by Plautus, was carrying the *furca*. This was in the form of a V, and was placed over the back of the neck upon the shoulders, while the hands were bound fast to the thighs.

So general was the ill treatment of slaves that men who, in other respects, are mentioned as noble and upright, thought it no discredit to treat them worse than their cattle. Thus we read that Cato, the censor, would often after supper take a thong and flog such of his slaves as had not attended properly. He also excited quarrels among them to prevent their plotting against him.§ Plutarch, in condemnation of Cato, says, “I must regard it altogether too hard in him, that after he had used his slaves like cattle till they were old, he should drive

“‘Go, crucify that slave.’ ‘For what offence?
Who’s the accuser? Where the evidence?
Hear all: no time, whatever time we take
To sift the cause, when a man’s life’s at stake,
Can e’er be long: hear all, then, I advise.’
‘Dolt! idiot! Is a slave a man?’ she cries.
‘He’s innocent; be it so: ’tis my command,
My will; let that, sir, for a reason stand.’”

GIFFORD'S JUVENAL.

† “Know, O judges, that Strato was crucified, after having his tongue cut out.”

‡ Epigram x, 56, 6.

§ Vita Catonis, § 5.

them forth and sell them; which implies that one man stands to another in no relation except that of gain, whereas we may see that a greater province is to be conceded to affection than to mere legal right. I at least would never sell an old labouring ox, and much less would I part with an old slave, who had grown up on the same soil with myself, and been accustomed to the same mode of life, and drive him forth, as it were, from his country, and sell him for a little money. But Cato, who, in this point, went to an extreme, even left behind him the horse he had used in Spain, that he might save the state the cost of his transportation. Now, whether this be magnanimity or a standing upon trifles, I leave each one to judge."

In the time of the emperors the ingenuity of cruel masters seemed tasked to invent new forms of torture, and the treatment of slaves was horrible in the extreme. We might multiply quotations from Juvenal and Martial to prove this. The greatest punishments were often inflicted for most trivial offences. Seneca says the poor slave had to stand all night at the pillow of his dissipated master, and perform most loathsome menial offices for him. A cough, a sneeze, or a gentle whisper was considered a great offence, as it disturbed the quiet of the debauched reveller, and was punished with the severest scourging.

There is the well-known story of the slave who accidentally broke a crystal vase at an entertainment where Augustus was present. His master immediately ordered him to be thrown to the fishes; and although Augustus interceded for his life, the inhuman master had the sentence executed. Such masters sometimes suffered terrible retribution from the vengeance of their slaves. Pliny* tells us that the slaves of Largius Macedo, whose father had himself been a slave, suddenly attacked him as he was bathing at his villa. After cruelly maiming and mutilating him, they threw him upon the glowing pavement of the bath to see if life were extinct. Pliny adds that he lived long enough to have the solace of revenge.

The early Romans, from their simple habits of life, required the service of but few slaves. Toward the end of the republic, when Rome, by her wealth and conquests, had brought hordes of slaves to her capital, an almost incredible number were kept by the nobility. It was customary to have a slave for almost every distinct work. Cicero speaks of the meanness of the household of Piso, because the same slave served for cook, and for taking care of the reception-room. In the houses of the wealthy Romans, there were slaves who acted as their master's stewards, attending to all their money transactions, and sometimes engaging in trade on their master's account,

* Epis. iii, 14.

for it was not reputable for the senator or patrician to be engaged directly in trade.

There was a class of slaves, and quite important functionaries they were, whose business was to bear the *lectica*, or sedan-chair, for their master or mistress. The strongest and best-looking slaves were selected for this duty—Syrians, Celts, Germans, and Capadocians. Before them went another class of slaves, called *anteambulones*, whose business was to clear the way for the *lectica*, which they did by crying out, *Date locum domino meo*. The Romans were fond of this kind of display, and we find mention made of outriders before their carriages as early as the first century of our era.

The class of slaves called *nomenclatores* were considered very necessary to those who desired to attain office from the people. It was the business of these slaves to attend their master in his walks through the city, or to stand by his side when he received his morning visitors, and announce to him the name of each person he met, or each one that called upon him; for the common people expected many little attentions from those who asked for their votes. The houses of the aspirants for public honours must be open to all who called, and they were themselves expected to speak by name to each one they met in their walks through the city.

There were separate classes of slaves in the houses of the great to take care of the clothes of the master, to attend him when he dined abroad, to take charge of his garments and shoes, and, as guests furnished their own napkins, to carry these. This latter custom went out of fashion, as it was found the slave would use the napkin to wrap up any light article he could pilfer.

We find that slaves worked in almost every capacity, and occupied almost every position in trades and professions. Where slavery is so general, labour becomes disreputable, and at Rome trade and commerce, unless on an extensive scale, were considered mean and unworthy of the free-born Roman.* Hence the slave carried on the business transactions of his master. The slave was the teacher, the artist, the actor, the man of science, the physician.

The study of medicine was but little attended to at Rome in the early ages, and at a later period the practice was almost exclusively given up to foreigners, generally Greeks. The first practitioners were received with distrust and positive aversion. The elder Cato warned his son against medicine and the Greek physicians. He seems to have had more confidence in his receipt-book, filled with

* Cicero (de Officiis, i, 42) says: *Opificesque omnes in sordida arte versantur; nec enim quidquam ingenuum potest habere officina*. And again: *Mercatura autem, si tenuis sordida putanda est*.

traditionary medical lore, than in the skill of the disciples of Hippocrates. Doubtless the Romans had reason to distrust these early physicians, for there were probably many quacks among them. Plautus scourges them without mercy in his rough jokes; and Pliny considers them lawful game, for in one place he says, "Only a doctor is allowed to kill a man with impunity." As professional physicians were looked upon so unfavourably, the Romans employed trusty slaves as house-physicians. Female slaves were also employed in this capacity, as we find from inscriptions on their tombs. About the time of Tiberius, mention is made of oculists, dentists, and those skilled in the treatment of local disorders. The price of physicians was very low, only about \$250, while a skilful cook brought almost any price, and an accomplished actor was thought worth \$8000.

A class of educated slaves were employed as readers; for it was the custom of literary men, when at their meals or in the baths, to have some one read to them. The younger Pliny mentions this as the habit of his uncle, (*Ep.* iii, 5;) and Nepos says of Atticus, that he never took his meals without having some reading going on. The poet Martial complains of some who used to invite him to dine, and then bored him with their bad comedies, (iii, 50.)

Slaves were frequently employed as copyists, and brought much gain to their masters by copying books. Atticus employed a number of his in copying manuscripts for sale. Crassus acquired a large part of his immense wealth by having slaves trained and educated for different professions. Such slaves were often sold for large sums; thus while a common labourer was bought for less than a hundred dollars, thousands were paid for an accomplished grammarian,* a successful actor, or a good librarian.

At the banquets of the wealthy Romans every resource was tried to add to the pleasure of the entertainment. The table was spread with a lavish luxury that has no parallel in modern times. For the amusement of the guests, musicians, and sometimes dancers, were introduced. Among the Greeks the host would have been thought inferior in accomplishments if he could not take part in those arts which graced their festal banquets. Epaminondas was distinguished as a singer and player on the harp; Pelopidas was an elegant dancer and a skilful musician. The Roman, while he imitated the Greeks in having music and dancing at his feasts, did so, as a late reviewer† says, in the spirit of Lord Chesterfield's instruction to his son:—"If you are fond of music, it is all well; get a Frenchman or Italian to twang and whistle to you; but never let me see you

* One Sabinus, according to Seneca, paid about five thousand dollars for a literary slave.

† London Qr., vol. lxxix.

with a pipe in your mouth, or a fiddle under your chin." So the wealthy Roman kept among his slaves skilful artists for the gratification of his guests. Frequent mention is made of the *symphoniaci*, the corps of household musicians; so that we infer they were kept in many families. In the later and more degenerate days of the Roman state, mountebanks, mimes, and other similar classes are mentioned, as exhibiting their skill at private entertainments. As the savage ferocity of the Romans introduced gladiatorial contests at their banquets, some masters had their slaves trained for these contests, and let them out both for public and private exhibition.

There were also deformed and idiotic slaves, who were highly prized by the perverse taste of some masters. The more stupid such were, the higher price they brought. A good fool was considered cheap at eight hundred dollars. Fancy prices were often paid for them. Martial* describes one with sharp head and long ears, which he moved like an ass. Seneca, speaking of there being a female slave, a fool, in his family, declares that he is very averse to such a vitiated taste; "for if I ever wish," he says, "to be amused with a fool, I do not have to seek far—I laugh at myself."† Of course, it was not even in every great house that all these different classes of slaves were. And yet on some estates the number was so great that they had to be classified. Many of these slaves were kept for show. We infer from Horace that it was customary for the rich in their walks to be attended by a large retinue. He‡ speaks of one who often had two hundred, and often only ten slaves to accompany him. He ridicules the prætor Tullius for being attended by only five slaves in going from his villa to Rome.

It is impossible to estimate the number of slaves in Italy or Rome at any given period. Some wealthy Romans are said to have had ten or even twenty thousand. The slaves of Crassus formed a large part of his fortune. He had more than five hundred architects and masons. Scaurus had about four thousand domestics, and as many field-slaves. During the civil wars, a freedman of Augustus, who had sustained great losses, left more than four thousand slaves, besides other property.

The numerous wars of Rome kept up an abundant supply for her market. Wars were carried on in ancient times with extreme cruelty, and by the common law of nations the vanquished was consid-

* Epig. vi, 39. "Hunc vero acuto capite et auribus longis
Quæ sic moventur, ut solent asellorum."

† Ep. I. "Si quando fatuo delectari volo, non est mihi longo quærendum;
me rideo."

‡ Sat. i, 3.

ered to have forfeited his life by his ill-success. If his life was spared he became the property of his conqueror. Prisoners were generally sold as soon as possible after the battle in which they were taken, for the slave-dealers usually followed in the train of the army. After the fall of the Samnites at Aquilonia, thirty-six thousand prisoners were sold. In the first Punic war, in the descent of the Romans on the African coast, twenty thousand prisoners were taken and sold. In the great victory of Marius over the Cimbri, sixty thousand were captured. Augustus, having overcome the Salassi, sold thirty-six thousand as slaves. Cæsar in his Gallic wars, is said to have taken over four hundred thousand prisoners, large numbers of whom were brought to Rome as slaves. Cicero, in the petty wars in which he was engaged, sold captives enough to amount to half a million of dollars.

Many slaves were acquired by commerce. We find early mention of the slave-trade in Africa. The Carthaginians* drove a brisk traffic in slaves, not only for home use, but also for exportation to foreign markets. These came from the interior of Africa, where kidnapping was extensively carried on by the petty chiefs. Negroes were considered somewhat an article of luxury at Rome, and commanded a fancy price. The satirists Juvenal† and Martial both allude to them.

The island of Delos was a large slave-market. It had its slave prisons, chains, and all the appliances for carrying on an extensive traffic. It is said that the sales would sometimes amount to ten thousand in a single day. Cilicia, Pamphylia, and Syria supplied it. Corinth was for a long time the great slave-mart of Greece; and from its commercial relations with Brundisium and the other sea-ports of Italy, it doubtless supplied the Romans with many slaves. Timæus tells us that Corinth had at one time four hundred and sixty thousand slaves.

The profits of the slave-dealers were enormous, but the business was always considered disreputable. In the camp of Lucullus captives were sold as low as about sixty-five cents a head, while the price of a common labourer at Rome was from seventy-five to one hundred and fifty dollars. The price of artisans, and such as possessed extraordinary acquirements, was often very great. Seneca‡ speaks of a pretender to literature, who had a number of learned

* Cum obsidibus Carthaginiensium magna vis servorum erat.—*Livy*, xxxii, 26.

† Tibi pocula cursor

Gaetulus dabit aut nigri manus ossea Mauri.—*Sat.* v, 52.

‡ Epist. xxvii.

slaves, for each of whom he had given nearly four thousand dollars. Suetonius* says Julius Cæsar gave extravagant prices for some of the slaves of his household; so extravagant that he was ashamed to acknowledge the amount. Juvenal† alludes to enormous sums paid for beautiful slaves. Martial‡ speaks of about four thousand dollars as being asked for a beautiful boy.

Only the cheaper kind of slaves were exposed in the market and publicly sold. They were stripped and placed on a wooden platform, so that every one could see and touch them. Martial§ describes a scene where the auctioneer frequently kisses the girl that is for sale, as an incentive for purchasers to buy. Each slave bore a tablet on his neck, on which were inscribed his name, his good and bad qualities. According to the Roman law the seller was bound to tell the faults of the slave he sold. To this Cicero|| alludes.

The more beautiful and expensive slaves were not thus publicly exposed, but were sold in the shops by private contract. We infer from what Martial¶ says, that some were in the habit of going round to these private slave-markets to merely look at the beautiful slaves. The extent to which such slaves were furnished for the vilest purposes can hardly be conceived of in modern times.

With all the evils of the system of Roman slavery, there was much hope to the slave of escape from his thralldom, for slaves were frequently emancipated, sometimes during the life of the master, and often by will. In some instances the emancipation was absolute, and at other times some conditions were imposed.

The manumission of slaves was of different kinds, and attended with certain legal forms.

What was called *manumissio vindicta*, was when the master appeared with the slave before the prætor or one of the higher magistrates, and a third person, in later times always a licitor, by an outward sign divested the master of all power over the slave. The licitor placing a little staff upon the head of the slave, pronounced the words, "Now I say that you are a free man." The master then took hold of the slave, and turning him round said, "I wish this man to be free." The magistrate sanctioned the declaration of the licitor, and formally announced that the ceremony was complete; after which the master and others present congratulated the new freedman in words we often meet with in Plautus and Terence, "I rejoice that you are free." It is probable that the grounds of manumission were given to the court, and put upon record; for this became necessary when limitations to the right were introduced. This *manu-*

* Julius, 47. † Sat. v, 55. ‡ Epig. i, 59. § Epig. vi, 66. || De Offic. iii, 17.

¶ Epig. ix, 60.

missio vindicta may be justly considered the oldest form. Vindicius,* who made known the conspiracy for the restoration of the Tarquins, is mentioned as having been freed in this way.

In the act called *manumissio censu*, the master had the name of the slave entered at once in the list of the censors as a free citizen. This took for granted that the slave had acquired from his earnings sufficient private property, or that the master gave him some fortune with his freedom. The simple entering of the name of the slave in the censor's list was all that was necessary to make this emancipation valid in the eye of the law.

Another kind was called *manumissio testamento*, manumission by will. It is evident that this was practised in early times, for it is mentioned in the laws of the Twelve Tables. The slave was either freed directly by an express clause of the will, or it was left to the heir to effect the emancipation. Sometimes conditions were annexed, as the payment of a certain sum to the heir; the lighting a lamp in connexion with solemn rites at the tomb of the deceased master; serving the heir during youth, or for a number of years.

There were also cases of informal manumission, as when the master declared his willingness that the slave should be free, without the regular forms of the law. Such still remained subject to the legal disabilities of slaves, though they could not be held in actual slavery, for the prætor would protect them against any attempt to reduce them to their former condition.

The emancipated slave received a name which marked him as a Roman citizen. He also assumed the *toga*, the dress of the freeborn Roman. Though legally and practically free, he still retained a relation of dependence to his former master. He was obliged to observe a respectful demeanour toward him, to assist him in misfortune, and not sue him at law. It is not, however, clear that the freedman, during the time of the republic, was liable to punishment if he conducted himself ungratefully toward his former master. But in later times, freedmen who had grossly violated their obligations to their patrons, might be punished, and in aggravated cases reduced again to slavery. Even earlier we read of scenes which show that the patrician demanded respect and attention from the freedmen. On one occasion, when the crowd in the forum by their clamours were interrupting Scipio Æmilianus, unable to endure their insolence, he cried out, "Silence, spurious sons of Italy." And again, "Ay, clamour as ye will; ye whom I brought bound to Rome will never make me fear, unbound though ye be now." "The silence," says the historian,† "by which this terrible denunciation

* Livy, book ii, 5.

† Michelet, History of Roman Republic, p. 217.

was followed, proves that the freedmen feared lest, descending from the rostrum, the conqueror of Carthage and Numantia should recognise his African or Spanish captives, and discover under the toga the marks of the whip."

Freedmen who had acquired wealth would often assume an air of consequence, and a style of living offensive to the Roman aristocracy. The shafts of the satirists are often aimed at these upstarts, who would look down upon the freeborn Roman. Horace, himself the son of a freedman, breaks out* in a strain of bitter invective at the presumption of a freedman who, insolent from his wealth and station, had taken his seat at the theatre in the place assigned for the nobility.

As there had been abuses connected with the exercise of the right of emancipation, the Roman law provided for its limitation. The slave had sometimes been emancipated for the sake of shielding him from judicial investigation and punishment. Some masters emancipated their slaves to secure the public gift of gain, a part of which the freedman was to return to his former master. Sulla selected ten thousand slaves, and gave them both their freedom and the right of suffrage, to secure for himself personal influence and safety.

It was at first provided by law that no slave who had been subjected to disgraceful legal punishment could obtain the privilege of citizenship. He could only secure such civil rights as were conceded to foreigners. It was afterward decided that only a certain proportion of the slaves of one master should be manumitted. Where the master held only one or two slaves, the law made no provision. Between three and ten only one-half could be emancipated; of any number under thirty one-third; under one hundred one-fourth; under five hundred one-fifth; and in no case whatever could a master emancipate more than one hundred.

Sometimes the state granted liberty to the slave when he had performed some act of public benefit. Livy† mentions that thirteen slaves were emancipated for saving the temple of Vesta. Slaves were also emancipated for giving information against criminals—sometimes receiving their liberty for this very purpose.

Any sketch of Roman slavery would be incomplete if it failed to notice the servile insurrections. It is not to be supposed that these large masses of men, in many respects fully equal to their masters, could be kept from knowing their own strength. Many Roman slaveholders lived in dread of the horrors of a servile war and of the terrible retribution which might await them. It was at one time

* Epode iv.

† Book xxvi, c. 27.

proposed in the senate that the slaves should wear a distinctive dress ; but the proposal was rejected, for it was not thought safe to let them know their own number. The danger of revolt was lessened from the close supervision under which the slaves were kept, and from the almost utter impossibility of harmony of action among them. The fact that so many were emancipated, and that all were eligible to the rights and privileges of the free, enabled the most intelligent to bide their time patiently. Yet there were several insurrections of the slaves that for a while menaced the very existence of Rome. As early as 458 B. C., Appius Herdonius, a Sabine, raised the standard of revolt, and called upon the slaves to break their oppressive yoke.* With Appius was a band of four thousand exiles and runaway slaves who by night had taken possession of the capitol. He proclaimed freedom to the slaves who should join him. His offer met with but little response, and after holding the capitol for a few days, he and his followers were routed and nearly all slain. Still later we read of a conspiracy of the slaves† to set the city on fire in different places.

In the year 196 B. C. Etruria was threatened with a fearful insurrection. In quelling it "many," says Livy, "were slain, many captured, and the leaders after being scourged were crucified."

One of the most formidable insurrections was that of the slaves of Sicily, 135 B. C. Sicily was divided at that time into large plantations, which were almost entirely cultivated by slaves. The cruelty of their overseers, and the hope of liberty, bound them together, though differing in language and habits. Eunus, their leader, pretended to have a revelation from heaven, and held the degraded bondmen under his control by the powerful influence of superstition. He kept the field for six months with seventy thousand troops, though large forces were brought against him. During this insurrection something like courts of justice were established, where the slave might arraign his master, and, recounting his cruelties, secure retributive vengeance. After the contest had been carried on for years, Roman discipline at length prevailed, and twenty thousand slaves fell in their last battle.

There were many other insurrections, both in Sicily and Italy. But the most important was the servile war, which occurred in the time of Pompey and Crassus, a few years before the birth of Christ. A large body of gladiators was kept at Capua by Lentulus Batiatus, to be let out for public festivals. Seventy-eight of them escaped from their barracks, and seizing on such arms as were at hand, they overpowered an escort having a large number of gladiatorial weapons. They took up their quarters in the then extinct crater of Mount

* Livy, book iii, c. 15.

† Livy, book iv, c. 45.

Vesuvius. They chose for their leader Spartacus, a Thracian by birth, a man of courage and genius.

The insurgents were victorious in several engagements with the regular troops, and from them obtained a supply of arms. Spartacus proclaimed the freedom of the slaves, and great numbers joined him from all parts of southern Italy. The number of his troops at one time amounted to one hundred thousand men. The war was carried on as servile wars usually are—with great barbarity on both sides. Three prætors and two consular armies were completely defeated. Several of the principal cities of Campania were taken and plundered. The insurgents possessed large establishments for the manufacture of arms; and such was their strength, that had it not been for dissensions among themselves, they might have consummated the plan of their leader, escaped from Italy and settled in colonies beyond the Alps. They were finally conquered by Crassus; and are said to have lost one hundred and five thousand men during the course of the war. The dead bodies of the defeated insurgents were impaled all along the high road from Capua to Rome. The ravages of this war were so great that Italy can hardly be said to have recovered from its effects during the time of the emperors. The free population was almost entirely extirpated, and the region divided into large estates which mainly served for pasturage.

The evil effects of this gigantic system of slavery were gradually developing themselves. Rome, it is true, was extending her dominion over the world, but a fatal disease was at her very heart. She sent her own freeborn sons to fight and to die on foreign soil, while she was bringing to Italy millions of slaves to till the large estates of her nobles, and to minister to the vices of her dissolute rulers. But the system was gradually working its own ruin, and with it the ruin of the empire. Slavery made labour disreputable. Slaves occupied the positions and were engaged in the pursuits which might have furnished employment for the poor common people. Almost the only occupation left for the poor Roman was agriculture; and from this he was finally driven by the competition of the wealthy landholder, who cultivated his estate by the unpaid labour of slaves. After his little farm had been added to the large estate of the wealthy capitalist, the poor, but freeborn Roman lounged about the capital, feeding upon the bounty of his patron, or supported at the public cost,* content if his daily wants were supplied, and his fierce passions gratified by the shows of wild beasts and gladiators.

* When Cæsar assumed the command at Rome, he found three hundred and twenty thousand persons receiving corn from the state. He left one hundred and fifty thousand.

"A large portion of the urban population, whom the nobles systematically debauched, were no better than a needy rabble, dissolute in morals, and destitute of any sense of national honor. The ready market offered for their votes was attractive to the lowest and vilest of the Italians; and the mob of the comitia was swelled by the worst class of the new citizens. Too proud to work, where labour was the mark of the slave, a multitude of freemen, steeped in the lowest poverty, found a bare subsistence in their idleness from this annual sale of their highest privilege, and presented ready instruments for any political adventurer who promised either present pay or prospective rapine."*

Deep was the degradation of the slave, but that of the poor citizen at last became deeper. Through all classes of society the purity of ancient manners had become changed to open dissoluteness. The standard of morals had become low; the marriage tie lost its binding force; and women of rank, says Seneca, counted years, not by the number of consuls, but by the number of their husbands. The evils of slavery affected every class of society; but especially did it tend to crush lower and lower the free labourer, till it made him the idler about the forum, living upon the sale of his vote.

There had been from the earliest times at Rome mutual jealousy and animosity between the noble and the plebeian, between the rich and the poor. Slavery tended to make a wider separation. It left Rome no large middle class—the "solid men," who weigh carefully their own interests and the well-being of the state, before they disturb the existing forms of government. What Rome needed was the large class of mechanics, of tradesmen, of manufacturers, of teachers, of physicians; in fine, of men all through the trades and professions, enjoying the rights of citizens. But all these places were filled by slaves; and the separation between the two divisions of the people at Rome became wider and wider.

It was this system of slavery that more than any one other cause hastened the downfall of the Roman empire. "The radical vice," says Guizot, "of the Roman society, and of every society in which slavery exists on a large scale, where the master rules over a troop of slaves, is the same. In all countries, in all times, under every form of polity, after an interval more or less long, by the effect alone of the enjoyment of power, of intellectual development, and of all social advantages, the superior class end in becoming weak and effeminate." This was most clearly seen in the history of Rome; for, from the time of the civil wars, slavery went on slowly maturing her ruin. It impoverished the land, so that Rome was dependent on the granaries of Africa for her bread. It increased dissoluteness and the most loathsome forms of vice, as may be seen in the pages of her own satirists; so that her own sons were degraded

* Merivale, *History of the Romans under the Empire*, vol. i, p. 49.

below the slave. Rome fell not because the northern tribes poured their barbarian hordes into the plains of Italy, but because the manliness of the old Roman was gone, and a degenerate race were holding the reins of government. And were there through the history of Rome no opponents of such a system? Were there no philanthropists whose hearts moved in pity to the poor bondsmen? Were there no far-seeing statesmen who could behold the impending ruin of their country? Were there no patriots who, seeing the corrupting influence of slavery, were ready to suggest a remedy? It seems to have been taken for granted that slavery must exist; yet some saw its tendency, and attempted to avert its dangers. The Gracchi, in their purpose to divide the public lands among the poor citizens, hoped to establish a yeomanry, who should till the soil, and serve as a wholesome check upon the wealthy aristocracy. They also designed that the amount of land to be held by any one family should be limited, so that all the landed estates of Italy might not be in the hands of a few. The Gracchi were unsuccessful, and great injustice has been done to their names. They were not rash innovators, but men of large views; and had their plans been carried out, slavery would not so soon have made free labour disreputable, nor so soon have made fertile Italy an unproductive waste.

Without doubt, the far-seeing and comprehensive mind of Julius Cæsar perceived the danger that threatened his country from this source. But it was a gigantic evil, and could be only averted by prudent policy. Cæsar issued a decree that one-third of the labour of Italy should be performed by freemen. What would have been the result; or what further plans he may have had to modify the system, we cannot tell; for he was assassinated before this decree could be carried into effect.

The system was greatly modified under the Christian emperors, and more humane laws were enacted. One provided against the separation of families. The church was a sanctuary for the slave of a cruel master, and no merciless law obliged the fugitive to be surrendered. The testimony of slaves was also taken in questions affecting both themselves and their masters.

NOTE.—In preparing this article, besides the Latin authors, we have consulted Becker's *Gallus oder Römische Scenen aus der Zeit Augusts*; Becker's *Handbuch der Römische Alterthümer*; Blair's *Inquiry into the State of Slavery among the Romans*; Wallon's *Histoire de L'Esclavage dans L'Antiquité*; and a valuable Essay in the *Biblical Repository*, vol. vi, by the late Professor B. B. Edwards.

ART. VII.—HASE'S CHURCH HISTORY.

A History of the Christian Church, by DR. CHARLES HASE, Professor of Theology in the University of Jena. Translated from the seventh and much improved German edition, by CHARLES E. BLUMENTHAL, Professor of Hebrew and Modern Languages, Dickinson College, and CONWAY P. WING, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pa. New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 8vo, pp. 720. 1855.

EVERY age of the world is characterized not only by diversities, but by contrarieties; and of these we refer not so much to outward appearances, to the mechanical arrangements and superficial relations of society, as to the inward forces which make up the real life of the world, and which, by their working, give shape to history. Conservatism and radicalism are opposite forces, omnipresent in the history of man, struggling, whether in one mind or in many, through periods of greater or less length, according to the stimulus of the times and the material to be wrought, till, having made the circuit of a nation or of an empire, and having concentrated the strength of opposition on one or a few issues, they fairly meet and fight for the mastery. These decisive contests form crises of development and make eras in history. Spiritualism and materialism are two other tendencies of equal prevalence with the former, and often in close relations with them, but never of necessity coincident; *i. e.*, either of the former may be united with and pervaded by either of the latter, according to the *animus* of that period which, at any point in history, is the past. If that period was spiritualistic, then conservatism will be spiritualistic, and radicalism materialistic; and, *mutatis mutandis*, the reverse will take place.

These several forces are now at work upon a grand scale throughout the civilized world. And, in proportion to the greater extent and elevation of the stage of action, compared with that of preceding ages, will be the greater violence of the contest, and the greater import of the decision. Modern civilization, like everything else, though radical in reference to that which preceded it, is very conservative of itself; and, though embracing more of the globe than any previous form of civilization, it is second to none in the unity of spirit pervading the whole. Its material conquests have been made tributary to harmony of feeling among the nations.

A happy consequence of this is, that nations become *complementary* to one another, not only in commerce and politics, but, what is of greater moment, in intellectual and moral culture. It is a witty,

but likewise philosophic, saying of Jean Paul, "that Providence has given to the French the empire of the land, to the English the empire of the sea, and to the Germans the empire of the air." These three forms of matter are strikingly symbolical of the distinctive characteristics of the three peoples. The land is a fair type of the materialism of the French mind, which prefers the domain of natural science; water, of the restless activity and yet conservative practicality of the English mind, which represents itself in political science and ecclesiastical polity; and air, of the spiritualism and subjectivity of the German mind, which finds its element in speculative philosophy and theology. With these three nations, combining their peculiarities, modern civilization is complete in its endowment of forces, and tends mightily toward perfection. It remains to be seen whether America, bringing them all together on a single arena, will raise civilization to its highest point. It cannot be doubted that the deep thinkers and universal scholars of Germany are now fulfilling a high mission in counteracting and neutralizing the materialism of the age. Religion is an active constituent of the German mind. Nowhere on the globe has Christianity a stronger hold than in the land of the Reformation, and almost nowhere else does it enlist a genuine *scientific* interest. All Church histories, for example, of permanent scientific value, have proceeded from German sources. The perfection of the method of history, now so fully recognised by the scientific world, itself a product of the German mind, has been as nearly attained in the late Church histories of Germany as in any existing historical works. The fruit of this must be the possession on the part of the Church of a clearer consciousness of her real constitution and of her appointed mission.

The flourishing period of Church history still in progress was inaugurated by Mosheim in his "Institutes of Ecclesiastical History," a work of unparalleled excellence at the time of its appearance, but in philosophic character vastly below the great works in the same department which have since appeared—such as Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Guericke's "Hand-book of Universal Church History," Gieseler's "Compendium of Ecclesiastical History," and the works of Niedner, Gfrörer and Hase. To this list should be added, Schaff's "History of the Apostolic Church," an admirable work in itself, and forming an introduction to a promised History of the Church down to the present time. For its philosophical character, the work of the Roman Catholic historian, Möhler, is likewise worthy of mention. These are the prominent *universal* histories of the Church. Those confined to certain periods, or embracing only limited subjects,

such as doctrine, or a particular doctrine, polity, art, &c., &c., are almost innumerable, and are the best proofs of the intense interest felt in this particular kind of history.

The translation into English of the work named at the head of this article is a boon to American students who are not masters of the German language, inasmuch as it contains a vast amount of knowledge compressed with wonderful skill into a small compass, and so gracefully presented, even with all the encumbrance of dates and divisions, as positively to forbid weariness on the reader's part. There is no manual extant in the English language worthy to be compared, in point of scientific character, with the one before us. The translation of such a book into good readable English was no easy task; but Messrs. Blumenthal and Wing have accomplished it. Their version of Hase is not only faithful, but with few exceptions neat and fluent, and revealing to our eyes, in a pretty faithful reading, very few grammatical errors or inelegancies of diction. The merits of the book will be made to appear more particularly as we proceed in the application of general principles.

The true idea of Church history cannot be attained until we have analyzed the two ideas associated in it—that of History, and that of the Church.

1. *The Idea of History.* Like everything else, history may have an objective and a subjective definition, according as we view it in its own constitution merely in relation to other things also objective; or, in its relation to the mind which apprehends it, and in the properties through which it is manifested to that mind. Objectively, a tree is composed of root, trunk, branches, leaves, flower and fruit; subjectively, it is a plant with a woody stem, having branches, &c.,—when of a small size called a shrub, when of a larger size called a tree, *par excellence*. In the former case, it is considered simply as to its material forms; in the latter, as to those forms apprehended by the mind, in giving it a classification among the varieties of the vegetable kingdom. Again, a government is, on the one hand, an aggregation of offices, in a certain place, and at a certain time, among a certain people; on the other hand, it is a particular form of authority, animated by a particular spirit, derived from a certain origin, and working out certain results. So history is, objectively, the collective whole of the facts that have transpired in the world; and, subjectively, it is the scientific apprehension by the historian of events in their true relations. This apprehension itself is true, in proportion as it recognises, under the actual conditions of time and space, and in their true relations, the two great factors of history, God and Man.

2. *The Idea of the Church.* Of this, as in the former case, there are two views, regarding it either as an organization of certain parts and a certain operation, or as a form of humanity apprehended in its genesis, growth and tendencies. Several closely related definitions may be given, as we view the Church in connexion with our Lord Jesus Christ, who is its living head; or in reference to believers who are its constituent parts, and who are human beings born again into a new life. In the former view the Church is either (a) "the kingdom of Christ," of which he spake when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and as such setting forth, in particular, the *authority* of Him who has "delivered us from the power of darkness;" or, (b,) "the body of Christ," according to the words of the apostle, "We are members of his body," and again, "He is the head of the body, the Church;" and, as such, giving form to the doctrine of the *life-union* between the Redeemer and those who believe on him. In the latter view, the Church is either (c) the communion (*κοινωνία*) of the faithful,—so we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another,—standing in genetic relationship to the definition (b;) or (d) it is a *pædagogic* institution, a combination of means for training believers in the present state of conflict as preparatory to a coming state of triumph and glory, and as such "the militant Church," and standing in genetic relationship to definition (a).

Now among these conceptions there ought to be found one capable of comprehending in itself all that is essential to the others. That one is the definition (b) above. For, as the head controls the natural body, so does Christ, the spiritual head of his people, govern them; and herein is supplied the idea of the "kingdom." And as the members of the natural body are so intimately connected as to feel in common whatever is pleasant or painful to sense, so will the members of Christ's spiritual body be pervaded by a sympathy that acts with the quickness and the power of instinct. As to the *discipline* of the members of "Christ's body," this is secured in the authority of the head. Therefore, all that is essential to the idea of the Church is comprised in the phrase "body of Christ." This conception, furthermore, is the only one which comports fully with the significance of the sacraments, (and particularly of the eucharist,) which are essential to the formal constitution of the Church. Therefore the Church is to be conceived of as something *organic*, and susceptible of growth, being neither, on the one hand, a loose aggregation of parts without affinity, nor, on the other hand, a fixed and hardened mass, incapable of development.

Church history is, therefore, objectively, the course of events that

have taken place in the progressive development of "the body" of our Lord Jesus Christ; the onward movements of the Christian life in its various normal types, offset with the abnormal workings of heresy and schism; and subjectively, it is that development conceived and represented by the historian in such order as shows the true relations of sequence and the real character of the Church in its successive periods.

The following extract will show the reader Dr. Hase's highly scientific conception of Church history:—

"The Church is always in a progressive state, i. e., it is striving to be a *perpetual manifestation of the life of Christ in humanity*. In other words, it is always aiming to exhibit his life more and more perfectly, and on a more extensive scale, sometimes in conflict and sometimes in connexion with the world. *Church history* is a representation of the Church in this progressive state by an exhibition of the facts which have occurred in its course. In its scientific form it is the combination of all those individual elements which have had any influence upon its composition, since it is, (1) *critically*, an impartial, honest and strict inquiry into facts, and into the extent of the confidence which can be reposed in their proofs, so that, where certainty cannot be attained, a knowledge of this extent in its different degrees may determine the scientific character of the narrative; (2) *genetically*, a statement of the facts in connexion with their causes, taking care, however, that no explanations are given inconsistent with the proper nature of the idea developed in the events, or with the peculiar character of the active agents in them; (3) *theologically*, an estimation of the facts in their precise relation to the religious spirit, allowing no preconceived opinions to determine what has actually occurred, but only to assist in understanding them as we find them."—*Introd.*, § 2.

A work of this kind should be characterized by the utmost precision of statement and definition; and so is Dr. Hase's book in the main. But the words italicised in the following quotation from § 1, convey an implication which we presume the author would not maintain, and which possibly escaped his notice:—"The Church stands in contrast with the world when the latter is regarded as including all forms of life which are merely natural, *and not of a religious character*." The implication, as every one must see, is not only that all religion is supernatural, but that all religion is a "manifestation of the life of Christ in humanity;" unless, indeed, the author should regard "the life of Christ" as only a particular manifestation of the religious spirit, in which case it remains, that all religion is supernatural, and that Christianity is not *essentially* distinguished from Judaism and heathenism. The term *world* should be made to include all religious life except the Christian; for although the various systems of heathenism may be attributed to a traditionary revelation of the primitive age of history, and though Judaism is based upon a historic revelation, yet no one of them, even on that ground, can claim the impartation of a *new life* to man, and therefore none of them can be a supernatural development.

We must concede to Dr. Hase a rigidly scientific conception of Church history. But, at the same time, we may be allowed to think that his views are too exclusively scientific, and his appreciation of the Church and her history too exclusively æsthetic. He does not seem to have much religious feeling, though his ecclesiastical connexions are orthodox. He appears, also, to have an ideal of culture which is largely humanistic, and conflicts somewhat with the perfect appreciation of the Christian ecclesiastical life. This is manifest in the general tone of the work. His criticism is not that of severe fault-finding, but rather of the most lively sense of the beautiful, and a keen disrelish of deformity fully capable of self-control, and showing a self-complacent smile and a gentle turn of the lip at what seems to him to smack of vulgarity, ignorance, or pretence. The book abounds in passages that show up the ludicrous side of a serious matter by a single dash of the pen, or by a mere circumstantial connexion: for instance, p. 106, "The great multitude, indeed, followed where fortune and power led the way; but Augustine found by experience, as Libanius had intimated, that it was easier to exclude the gods from the temples than from the hearts of the people, and that Jesus was not often sought for from disinterested motives." Often it is not so much what is said that produces the impression, as the tone and manner of it, as (p. 123) the remarks on Augustine's conversion, and (p. 198) the mention of the first host of crusaders.

The glimpses we get of Hase's doctrinal views indicate everywhere a deficiency of Christian feeling. Speaking of the edict of the apostolic council, (Acts,) he says: "This proceeding could not be reconciled with the original covenant, (Gal. ii, 1,) without considerable ingenuity of reasoning, and was not very consistent with the course which Paul sometimes pursued; but it was a well-intended scheme to harmonize those conflicting tendencies which were just springing up in the Church, and of which tradition gives us an account." We forbear remark upon this further than to say, that, if the circumcision of Timothy be the particular act of Paul, which seems to Dr. Hase inconsistent with the decree that he and Barnabas obtained from the council, the fact that one of Timothy's parents was of the Jewish nation, made an important difference between his case and that of persons of purely Gentile origin. The whole passage indicates a cool presumption, in the treatment of what Christians usually recognise as divine and infallible, that is scarcely consistent with deep piety.

That Dr. Hase has, however, in general, a lively appreciation of the good and the great, is readily conceded; it is abundantly

exemplified in this work. The book is not defective in scientific conception, nor in artistic finish, but in *the Christian spirit*; and this is a defect of so radical a kind as to affect not a little the execution of the scientific conception. Had Dr. Hase some of the orthodox straitness of Guericke, and above all the tender, heavenly piety of Neander, this manual would have been as nearly perfect as human works may be. Dr. Schaff beautifully remarks of Hase's book:—"All the more is it to be regretted, that we miss from this edifice of Gothic beauty the heaven-pointing tower, and the holy sign of the cross."

The *idea* of Church history being once established, the next step is to inquire into its *method*. Method includes both principle and plan; the rule by which the artist works in the effort to realize his ideal, and the scheme which he draws for himself as the embodiment of his rule and the outline of his picture. Every military general has his *method* of warfare. His ideal to be realized is victory; his rule is either stratagem or force, or both; his plan is the division of the field and the order of his troops. The orator aims at success in winning the minds of the multitude; his rule is conviction by argument, or persuasion by motives, or capture by enthusiasm; or, it may be, all of these combined; his plan is the order of times and circumstances, and the array of arguments, motives, or tragic displays of passion. The historian likewise has his rule and plan for actualizing his ideal, which is history in some form of conception. If his conception is of mere facts in the concrete, then his rule is narrative, and his plan *chronicle* and incident. If his conception is of facts as the exponents of the human mind, then his rule is pragmatism, and his plan is a psychological accounting for facts, with more or less reference to time and place, as well as the mental crises of the ages. But if his conception is of facts as the joint products of God and man acting in the same line of direction, with whatever difference of intention, then his rule is philosophic construction, and his plan the unity of human development, with due regard to great epochs and revolutions. This last is the highest view of history and the glory of the present age. Struck out with great originality by the wonderful mind of Herder, this theory was brought to its greatest completeness by Hegel, in whose hands however it was misused, because of his one-sided philosophical doctrine. But in this view alone does history attain its proper unity, and that scientific character which makes it worthy of a prominent place among liberal studies. And, what is more important, this mode of treatment alone brings all history into its legitimate connexion with theology, the highest

of sciences, and brings into a strong light the bearing of time upon eternity.

Now in the department of Church History we find a development of humanity produced by the operation of *divine influences* ever at work with less or greater prevalence and intensity throughout the body in general and its members in particular. The history of the Church is something supernatural. Therefore in treating it we are to recognise not only the general presence of God in the affairs of men, but also the particular presence and agency of Christ and the Holy Ghost in the Church. "*There* God acts as Creator, Preserver, and Ruler of the world, and man in his natural, fallen state: *here* God manifests himself as the Saviour and Sanctifier of the world, and man comes into view as an object of redeeming love and as a member of the kingdom of grace. Secular history is the theatre of Elohim, or God under his general character, as Father of Gentiles as well as Jews. Sacred history, and its continuation Church history, is the sanctuary of Jehovah, the God of the covenant, the Lord of a chosen people."—*Schaff's Hist. Ap. Ch. Introd.*, p. 5.

All the earlier Church histories, such as those of Eusebius, Theodoret, Evagrius, Sozomen, and Socrates, were of the simple narrative character, and written from an apologetico-polemic point of view. And even down to Mosheim, all were prominently annalistic, and from a position more thoroughly polemic. Mosheim (*Introd.*, § 1) aimed at a "faithful narrative of the external condition and internal state and transactions of that body of men who have borne the name of *Christians*; and in which events are so traced to their causes that the providence of God may be seen in the establishment and preservation of the Church, and the reader's piety, no less than his intelligence, be advanced by the perusal."

This indicates a high point of view compared with his predecessors. But it is evident, not only from this extract, but also from the whole work itself, that in its events are contemplated *psychologically*, and "the providence of God" is regarded more as a supervision than an agency. Later historians, with a more elevated philosophical groundwork, look every one through the medium of his own peculiar development and ecclesiastical connexion. And of this we cannot complain if the writer subordinate his bias in all cases to impartial love of truth. Dr. Hase says very truly:—

"It is not, however, indispensable to the impartiality of the historian, that he should appear to love nothing and to hate nothing. It is only needful, first of all, that he should never place the actual facts in false positions, on account

of either preferences or aversions; and then, that he should recognise those conditions under which others have, perhaps necessarily, formed opinions and sentiments different from his own. Indeed, a Church history in which the author exhibited no distinct ecclesiastical character, and did not imprint this with clearness upon his work, would be of very little value to the Church."—*Introd.*, § 5.

But how stands our author with regard to the *doctrine of method* above delineated? He seems to us quite sound in theory, but less so in practice. He says (*Introd.*, § 1):—"This contrast" (that is, between the Church and the state) "is only in particular relations, since the state also is a *divine institution*, and the world was created by God, and is intended to be gradually pervaded by the Church." This taken together with the second section, quoted above, will prove the general correctness of his theory. But the quotations and references given under our first paragraph, show how little effect the presence and agency of the Holy Ghost—a doctrine avowed in general terms in his introduction—has had upon his own mind in the composition of the history. We think, moreover, that a candid, Christian mind, will gather the impression that he forgets, as far as the nature of the subject will allow, even the *general agency of God in history*: so that, in the second division of the first period of the history of the Church, a time when controversy was waged with Judaism and heathenism, "the principles which finally obtained the ascendancy, for that reason only became those of the Catholic Church," (§ 74;) and, in the second period, the "Nicene creed is the product chiefly and almost exclusively of imperial authority," (§§ 102, 103;) and the Nestorian controversy is but little else than a "strife of mere intrigues," (§ 113.) The position from which he starts would lead us to expect a treatment of the controversies of the Church, setting forth the *divine working* in bringing to the consciousness of God's people a *clear apprehension of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity*,—a view that throws sanctity and glory around those strifes, which otherwise, from the large admixture of merely human elements, appear so lamentable, and sometimes even contemptible. But our expectation is disappointed. Human cunning, personal ambition, court policy, and reckless speculation, play before us in bald deformity. These have brewed their own storm, and no Neptune, rising from the deep, frightens the billows into rest. The carnal disciples struggle with the tempest in their own strength, and no calm voice is heard, saying, "*Peace, be still.*" What we say is particularly true of the earlier portions of the history. The author's sympathy with the first age of the Church is scarcely an assignable quantity,

and with the later ages it is only that of an artist with his picture.

We must not pass this criticism, however, without allowing that *a manual*, such as this, in which the matter is so thoroughly compressed, affords a writer less opportunity to make clear his doctrinal and philosophic views, and circumstances may almost compel him, at times, to a brevity and coolness of statement that seems like indifference to great truths. But for *this* we make no complaint. We object only, in the present work, to that which is positively *inconsistent* with the fundamental doctrines of Church history. The sum of our criticism on this head is that Dr. Hase has given us the *body* of the history of the Church with imperfect and somewhat deceptive reflections of the *soul*. His method is chiefly *external*. As to his *plan*, it is not strictly philosophic in the sense we have laid down, nor is it simply pragmatic. It would have been philosophic, if his moral and æsthetic habitudes had allowed him to fulfil his theoretic conceptions of the Church and of history. The highest demand of the philosophic treatment is that the writer, from the stand-point peculiar to this method, give himself up to his material, making it thoroughly objective, both in its outward constitution and in its animating spirit. A task so difficult is attainable by few; and while Dr. Hase comes so far short, he may justly claim a high place for what he has accomplished.

The division of the history into ages and periods will strike every one, we think, as beautiful for simplicity and precision. There is great room for diversity among writers in the minor divisions of history; and while the great eras are undisturbed, this diversity can have but little effect on the composition. We sketch the division, as follows, referring to the work (Introd., § 9) for particulars.

AGE I.—ANCIENT CHURCH HISTORY, A. D.		1-800.
Period 1.....		1-312 Constantine.
" 2.....		312-800 Charles the Great.
AGE II.—MEDIEVAL CHURCH HISTORY, A. D.		800-1517.
Period 3.....		800-1216 Innocent III.
" 4.....		1216-1517 Martin Luther.
AGE III.—MODERN CHURCH HISTORY, A. D.		1517-1853.
Period 5.....		1517-1648 Peace of Westphalia.
" 6.....		1648-1853 Present Time.

This work is distinguished by a peculiarity which to many persons will give it a special interest; we mean the introduction of

comprehensive notices of ecclesiastical art, in the different periods after it once had an existence. No other historian of the Church has given this subject a formal treatment. It is noticed by Neander briefly, in connexion with the subject of worship. The reader will find himself both entertained and instructed by §§ 139, 267, 390 and 487. And if he has been too far swayed by the Puritanic proscription of taste in ecclesiastical building and decoration, which has generally prevailed in American churches, he may feel a new chord stirred in his heart by the contemplation of the Church as "a new temple of Solomon, a type of the earth with all its children, and the vault of heaven stretched above them;" and he may breathe a gentle sigh, in the spirit of the great Puritanic bard of a former age, for

"The storied windows richly dight,
Casting a dim, religious light."

In power of condensation Dr. Hase has few equals, and certainly none can surpass him. The following are examples taken at hazard:—

"In England, *Dunstan*, (d. about 990,) an abbot, and a triple bishop, versed in all the knowledge prevalent in his day, so powerful that he held even the devil in his tongs, and, though personally devoted to his own visions in worldly matters, so politic that he entirely controlled three successive kings and broke the heart of another who presumed to resist him, attempted to reform the voluptuous lives of the priesthood by putting his monks in the place of those clergymen who would not give up their wives."—§ 201.

"*Philip*, the youthful landgrave of Hesse, after the diet of Worms, joined the party of the Reformation, became a personal friend of Melancthon, and declared (1525) that he would rather part with his lands and subjects than to abandon the word of God. As a leader of his party he was crafty, but at the same time upright, fond of novelties, a pious Christian, a firm friend of the Bible; but either independent of the theologians, or with a singular scrupulosity bringing them to his terms; full of confidence, not only in divine aid, but in the worldly means by which a spiritual revolution was to be effected; intelligent, and in his best days powerful."—§ 322.

But we need not multiply illustrations of that marvellous skill which every section exemplifies.

Our author has also a rare skill in the graphic delineation of life and character. His pictures rise before us, not as if by magic, or by any hidden contrivance on which we dare not gaze except to dissipate the charm that spells our eyes, but as the works of a consummate artist, seated in our very presence, and bidding the obedient canvass represent the visions of his mind. The colouring is cold; but the outline is bold, the expression lively, and the action natural. In addition to the miniatures given above, the reader may refer to "The Cistercians, and St. Bernard," (§ 207,) and to the larger pictures of St. Francis of Assisi, and St. Domingo, the Castilian, (§ 265.)

We cannot withhold the following extract from the description of Francis :—

“ Whenever Francisco attempted to pronounce a studied discourse he was always confounded ; but when he spoke from a sudden impulse, his spirit broke forth from the depths of his heart like a storm. Like some minnesinger he celebrated the delicious raptures of heavenly love, and the devotion of all nature for its Creator. He seems to have possessed a child-like spirit, which loved to commune with all forms of natural life, and made him salute all creatures as brethren and sisters. After many vain longings to die in proof of his love, he perceived that he was to become like the crucified Redeemer, not by a bodily martyrdom, but by the intensity of his devotion. He at last died, lying naked on the ground, in his favourite church, (Oct. 4, 1226,) with the five wounds of Christ imprinted on his body.”

We have thus far endeavoured to do justice to Dr. Hase and his work, giving credit where it is due, and, we trust, finding fault only where it is just. Notwithstanding the defects of the book, we can cordially recommend it as the best compendium of the history of the Christian Church that has ever been written. We trust that it will be promptly adopted by the proper authorities as the text-book of Church-history in our “ Course of Study.” Indeed, it would be unjust to the young men who are coming forward in the ministry to compel them to spend their time and toil in studying the miserable compends now accessible to them, when so admirable a manual as this can be put into their hands.

We cannot conclude without expressing the hope that this work may contribute to the taste for ecclesiastical history among us. Much of the indifference to it heretofore existing is due to the imperfections of the books. But this is rapidly being obviated, and it is to be hoped that few will hereafter be found ready to charge the history of the Church with a tedious dullness, not to say a vexatious violence upon the better feelings. Among the questions of our day none can vie in importance with the question of the Church—her *unity*, and her outward relations ; her ground in the past, and her hold upon the future. That the Church, as such embracing all true Christians, whether Papist or Protestant, may attain a right sense of *herself*, and be pervaded by the fulness of the glorious life that comes from her divine Head ; that she may attain this, next to the immediate communion of believers with the Lord Jesus, through faith and prayer, a study of her history is necessary. Nothing would be more conservative of her present integrity, nothing more purifying to her judgment and conscience.

ART. VIII.—LETTERS ON RECENT FRENCH LITERATURE.

LETTER V.

PARIS, May, 1855.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW,—Dr. Johnson used to say, with an air of national concession, that the French had, even at that day, a book upon every subject; although the Caliban of English letters would, of course, not answer for the *quality*. There was, however, at least one, and this a most important subject, on which they remained without a book till recently; so still remain, I scarce need add, the English language and no doubt all others.

Amid the vast multiplication and the fast modification of the materials and the conditions of the countless branches of human knowledge, there is no philosophic student who has not sighed for an authentic compend of the *facts and principles, established thoroughly*, in each department, to the latest date. A compilation of this description, which, if well constructed, could afterward easily be kept up to the pace of progress in successive editions, is a necessity to general thinkers. For no one man can have a practical acquaintance with many sciences; nor can he, without such acquaintance, collect reliable materials; to say nothing of waste of time and want of libraries. It might be added, that the general thinker is, by his very constitution, precluded from particular acquaintance with the special sciences. There was, in fact, a real consequence, beneath the verbal contrariety, in the antithesis of Goldsmith's line on Burke, in the *Retaliation* :—

“Though equal to all things, for all things unfit.”

The *though* should, in philosophy, be substituted by *because*; if Burke was verily unfit for all things, taken severally and in practice, it was because of his embracing all collectively. The two faculties are quite exclusive of each other; they mark precisely what are called talent and genius.

For all these reasons, it is clearly requisite to the efficiency of genius—that is to say the great faculty of construction and of discovery—that a repertory of sound materials should be presented for its searching surveys, and be prepared for this scrutiny by the coöperation of a large variety of special hands. Hence, accordingly, the recent origin of encyclopedias, of which this has been the dim object or the vague idea. But the execution of these compilations is far from answering the purpose indicated. It is wanting in the two prime requisites of succinctness and of selection. Encyclopedias are mere physical abridgments of the libraries—compilations of detailed treatises, not of doctrines and of facts. They bring together, under one title, in a cheaper and in fewer folios, perhaps, the substance of a great multitude of distinct works; but in addition to the disadvantage of presenting it at second-hand, they give it mingled with each writer's own views, and often modified by his hypotheses, so that it still is, intellectually, as inaccessible as ever to the speculative labourer in quest of *scientific elements*.

Lord Bacon, who himself had felt the want of such a storehouse, suggests a better method of supplying it, which may be gathered from three distinct forms in which the requisite recurs to him. His "*sylva*" would, with due extension and the selections described above, respond exactly to the collection of *facts*; the "*aphorisms*," which he also recommends, by precept and example, correspond to the collection of *principles*; in fine, the *de augmentis scientiarum*, in its indications of the special portions of the several sciences that are completed and are defective, presents a prototype for the collection of *comments*. Those three elements, in fact, are requisite to the completeness of the repertory; for the facts should be attended by the principles received to interpret them, and both should, by the comments, be directed upon new inquiries. So admirably comprehensive was the dim conception by the great reformer of that, for want of which alone, perhaps, he failed himself of being a great discoverer. An equally gigantic intellect, but of immensely superior learning, and accordingly a great discoverer—I mean Leibnitz—erects what really is the want in question into a department of general science, in his conjectural classifications in the *Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain*. But these suggestions, and these samples, remained for almost two centuries without inducing even an attempt at realizing their prescriptions. At last, however, the gap is partly filled up in French literature, by a work entitled, *Universal Dictionary of Sciences, Letters, and Arts*.*

I say partly, for the execution falls far short of the preceding outline, as also did, indeed, the purpose of the author. His aim, he tells us, was to "compile a work which would take an intermediate position between the technical dictionaries and the encyclopedias;" which, less superficial than the former and less discursive than the latter, would present, upon each subject and with a rigorous exactness, the really indispensable notions; which at the same time would present them in the most succinct and substantial form, and which, through this brevity in the expression and a severe choice in the details, might condense these notions all in a single volume, plain to all." Thus, to purvey, not for philosophers, but for the public, was the author's project; and on the accomplishment of this alone, he should be criticized as an author. Objections to the plan itself would lie only to the private thinker, and so would travel, as the lawyers express it, beyond the record before the court.

At the same time, I repeat, this plan includes, in large part, and indeed inevitably, the great philosophic requisite described. It presents us the established laws with all the processes and technicalities in each department of science and art, explained with more or less sufficiency. The progress of discovery as of improvement in the main departments is moreover sketched historically, though quite summarily. The leading works upon every subject are also indicated in a detailed reference, which is another feature of importance to the rummager of libraries. You cannot, in America, conceive the value of this indication. But it is absolutely necessary in Paris, where you will not, at the chief library, be shown a volume of any work without detailing upon

* DICTIONNAIRE UNIVERSEL DES SCIENCES, DES LETTRES, ET DES ARTS. Par M. M. N. Bouillet, Conseiller honoraire de l'Université, Inspecteur de l'Académie de Paris, &c., &c. Paris: Librairie de Hachette et Cie. 1854.

paper these four preliminary specialities: The name and surnames of the author, the exact title of the book, the special form of the edition, the place and year of publication. Nor are these formalities at all superfluous, when the work is to be looked for among *fifteen hundred thousand* volumes, which the Imperial Library holds at this moment.

But the prime utility of this dictionary is general, if not quite popular. It is a hand-book for the better class of readers, and even writers, who desire at least a summary knowledge of whatever they peruse or propagate. In no department of human knowledge, human action, or human expression, can they encounter a truth, a process, or a term which is not explained there. Such, at all events, is the engagement in the preface of the work, and both the author and the place of publication are a guarantee. At Paris, the execution was, in the most eminent degree, at the same time favoured in its means and controlled in its defects. The chief director, M. Bouillet, enjoys also the public confidence for his large, long, and even learned experience. He is the author of all the articles in the work on the mental and the moral sciences. He names a number of his co-labourers, who are also mostly men of competence; as, for example, the mathematical, the physical and the chemical sciences are treated by Charles Gerhardt, the author of a work of a first-class merit upon organic chemistry.

It may be added that M. Bouillet had moreover furnished a proof of fact, as his special fitness for this description of compilation. He is the author of another publication, which forms a counterpart, entitled a "Universal Dictionary of History and of Geography," and which has reached in a few years the *ninth* edition. This work professes, as he himself has very aptly characterized it, to do for the *names* of all the personages and the localities of time and space, what the recent work proposes for the *things* of art and nature. And its great success and high repute attest the excellence of the execution.

It would be idle, then, to add my personal opinion in this current notice. It would even be presumptuous in a simple individual to sit in judgment upon a compend of all knowledges and entire nature. I may say, however, that I notice, in glancing cursorily through the book, some slight mistakes, both of omission and commission. For example, in a literature so familiar as should be the English, there occur the following, in the single article of *Logic*:—1. Old Watts is represented as the "classical treatise" on the subject; 2. Wateley's "quite recent" book is dated 1850—too recent by some twenty years at least, since it appeared in the *Encyclopædia*; 3. Mill's *Logic* is not mentioned at all. But such writers are notorious for the slightness of their acquaintance with foreign literature, and especially perhaps with the English. They speculate on them intelligently, because this involves only generalities. But as to details and statistics they merely *cram* for the occasion. These, however, are of prime importance in such a work as that in question. It is, therefore, to be hoped that all such blemishes as those exemplified will be excluded in the course of subsequent editions. It is just to add, that the author has the candour and good sense to invite his readers to communicate to him any deficiency or errors they may discover. I may, therefore, take the liberty of venting my surprise, that even in the former "dictionary," which I have

looked into more closely, there should remain, after nine editions in the capital of Europe, several serious omissions of both ancient and modern personages; such, for instance, as Callicratides, Hippodamus, Bryonius, Hegel, Schelling, &c.; and this, while the work is brought up, in a Supplement, to 1852.

But these are trifles in a publication of such importance and extent, which I accordingly commend without reserve to all who read the French. There is no country where such compilations would be so useful as in America. Both the works should go together, and would make a complete cyclopædia, within a compass and at a cost not, I think, previously approached. They are each composed of one thick quarto volume in double-columned pages, of which the "Dictionary of Arts and Sciences" contains some seventeen hundred and fifty; the "Dictionary of Geography and History," over two thousand. The price of both would scarce exceed, I believe, \$10.

There has been still, it seems, another blank in French literature until lately, and one which may be thought more singular than the preceding. A publication, entitled the "Theology of Nature," (*Théologie de la Nature, par HERCULE STRAUSS-DURCKEIM, Docteur des Sciences, Paris, Victor Masson,*) proclaims itself, in terms, to be the *first* upon the subject; first, 'tis true, not in France alone, but the world over. Notwithstanding the naïve unconsciousness implied in the extension, the author's statement may be credited within the limits of his own country. For even the best-informed Frenchmen, as I have hinted you above, know really little of our temporary foreign literature, especially British. They have, moreover, another weakness which is partly the cause of this "effect defective"—that of concluding that whatsoever, in philosophy or letters, has not been done in France or Paris cannot have well been done elsewhere. It was probably this French inference that led our natural theologian to overlook his predecessors, even across the British Channel, from Bishop Butler, now a century back, down to Paley and the Bridge-water Treatises. Yet the two former are, I think, translated into French.

At all events, if this be really the first original attempt in France,—and I, for my part, recollect no other, I think, besides, the fact presumable,—the contrast is a matter for explanation. The chief cause is found in the distinction of religion. France has continued formally obedient to Catholicism, which rests alone upon tradition, upon testimony. England and the other countries of the Reformation who threw off this system, could only do so by destroying the value of its evidence. But as this sacrifice impaired somewhat the basis also of revealed religion, they were obliged to supply the ruin by an appeal from man to nature, from mere testimonial evidence to natural and scientific. This supplemental and similar evidence, moreover, was demanded by this more rational conception of the dogmas to be proved. Hence the natural theologies and natural evidences of theology which have been treated of in most or all, perhaps, the Protestant countries; while not a treatise of the description has, I think, appeared in any of the Catholic. It may be added that the contrast presents a concise demonstration of the superior rationality or civilization of the former nations. But this conclusion, as I have intimated, cannot properly apply to France; for here the contrast, as the catholicity, has long existed in little more than form.

ART. IX.—SHORT REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

It is of greatest concernment in the Church and commonwealth to have a vigilant eye how books demean themselves as well as men, and thereafter to confine, imprison, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors; for books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are.—MILTON.

(1.) "*Harper's Story Books*" promise well for the instruction and amusement of the young. We are pleased to see, from the first of the series, ("*Bruno, or Lessons taught by a Dog,*") that Mr. Abbott intends to admit more of the religious element directly into this series than found its way into the "*Franconia Stories.*" The second is even better than the first. "*Willie, or The Mortgage,*" is the story of a little boy, through whose good habits and principles his father was reclaimed from drunkenness, and prosperity brought back to the family. It is a good "*Maine Law*" tract for children. The third story, "*The Strait Gate,*" is the best of the series so far. No family in which there are young children should be without this cheap and entertaining monthly story-book.

(2.) "*Follow Jesus,*" (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers; 18mo., pp. 96,) is an excellent practical exposition of the duty urged in the title, by the author of the well-known tracts, "*Come to Jesus,*" and "*It is I.*"

(3.) "*The Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament.*" (London: Nisbet & Co., 1854; 12mo., pp. 309.) This is a sort of practical commentary upon the Hebrews, mainly made up, however, of illustrations from the Old Testament history, with lessons drawn from them. It is a very edifying and instructive book.

(4.) OF similar aim and tendency is "*Notes and Reflections on the Epistle to the Hebrews,*" by ARTHUR PRIDHAM." (London: Binns & Goodwin; 12mo., pp. 338.) There is a great deal of good devotional and practical reading in this book; but it has a Calvinistic and Millenarian vein, which will detract from its general acceptance and usefulness.

(5.) FRANCIS FORRESTER, Esq., has sent us the bound volume of "*Forrester's Boys' and Girls' Magazine,*" for the year 1854, (Boston: F. & G. C. Rand,) and we cordially recommend all our friends who wish to provide a monthly magazine for their children, in which they will find abundant amusement and instruction, without anything calculated to injure either their morals or their taste, to send on their names to the publisher.

(6.) "*Primary Class-book of Botany,*" by FRANCES H. GREEN." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855; 4to., pp. 102.) This neat volume is
FOURTH SERIES, VOL. VII.—30

designed for use both in schools and families, and contains a good view of the elements of vegetable structure and of the physiology of plants. It is amply illustrated.

(7.) "*Cornell's Primary Geography*" (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; square 8vo.) is certainly the best book for beginners in geography that has ever come under our notice. It omits all abstruse terms, gives maps, &c., covering precisely the ground illustrated in the lessons, and no more; and is amply furnished with questions for exercise and review.

(8.) THE "*Ladies' Repository*" (January to June, 1855. Cincinnati: Swormstedt & Poe; New-York: Carlton & Phillips) opens its new year with new type, new features, and new promises of excellence. Each of its editors seems to have surpassed his predecessor; only, however, by standing upon his shoulders: and Dr. Clark has certainly made the *Repository* go beyond its former excellent self in all the qualities which should go to the making up of such a magazine. It has a sure, because well-deserved hold upon popular favour. Religious without cant, learned without pedantry, tasteful without affectation, the "*Repository*" is a model magazine for ladies, and deserves a place in every Christian dwelling.

(9.) "*Oscar: or, The Boy who had his own Way*," (Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1855; 18mo.) is a very good story for boys, illustrating the evil consequences of disobedience to parents and teachers. Like "*Clinton*," by the same author, it is disfigured by ungrammatical and provincial expressions. We should be sorry to have our children inoculated with such diseases as "a real bad cold" or a "lung fever," so as to be compelled to "lay abed." Such defects are worse in children's books than in any others.

(10.) WE have received the eighth, ninth, and tenth numbers of "*Harper's Gazetteer of the World*," completing the work, which contains one thousand nine hundred and fifty-two closely-printed pages in double columns. It embraces, within the compass of a single massive volume, "a much greater number of names than any gazetteer now in existence," giving the latest and most reliable statistics of agriculture, commerce, population, &c. The most important facts of the latest *censuses* taken throughout the world are incorporated into the work. The basis of the book is "Johnson's General Gazetteer of the World"—one of the most complete ever published in Europe; and the labours of Mr. Smith, the American editor, have been principally devoted to that part of the work which covers the western hemisphere. It is with such a book as with the latest almanac—everybody that *can* must buy it.

(11.) "*The Religious Denominations in the United States: their History, Doctrine, Government, and Statistics*, by JOSEPH BELCHER, D. D." (Philadelphia: J. E. Potter, 1854; 8vo., pp. 1024.) This work contains a large

amount of information; and the editor has evidently sought to make his statements with regard to the different divisions of the Church both truthful and impartial. The work is adapted rather for general circulation than for the use of scholars; and in this view we may excuse its want of method and condensation: but we can imagine *no* excuse for the horrid wood-cuts with which it is *embellished*!

(12.) "*The Truth and Life; Twenty-two Sermons*, by the Rt. Rev. C. P. M'ILVAINE, D. D." (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1855; 8vo., pp. 508.) This is in many respects one of the most valuable of the many volumes that Bishop M'Ilvaine has written. The sermons are generally clear expositions of Bible doctrine, or fervent exhortations to Christian practice. They do not, indeed, belong to the class of brilliant discourses; a class which might well be spared from the stores of Christian literature; but they abound in strong and timely thoughts, expressed in manly, forcible, and appropriate language. Some of the leading abuses of Romanism are severely handled in the course of the volume; as are also the Romanizing tendencies of the Sacramentarians in the Church of England and in the Protestant Episcopal Church. In spite of certain doctrinal views with which we cannot agree, we cordially recommend this volume of "Sermons for the times" to our readers.

(13.) "*The Ways of Life, showing the Right Way and the Wrong Way*, by the Rev. G. S. WEAVER;" (New-York: Fowler & Wells, 1855; 12mo., pp. 157;) a series of lectures delivered in St. Louis. There is a good substance of manly, honest thought and purpose in the book; it aims at a high and generous morality. The style is sometimes eloquent; always clear and forcible; but the sentences are often too brief and asthmatic for our taste.

(14.) BOOKS on the Baptist controversy have been greatly multiplied of late. One of the best and most useful that has come under our notice is, "*Baptism; its Nature, Obligation, Mode, Subjects and Benefits*, by L. ROSSER, A. M." (Richmond: 1855; 12mo.) The work is divided into five parts, the topics of which are indicated in the title just cited. Each of these heads is treated at length, although the vital points of the controversy are of course more fully set forth than the others. The key to the author's view is that he regards the *mode* of baptism as nonessential; and that he considers its proper *subjects* to be infant children and believing adults. He grounds infant baptism upon the unconditional salvation of infants through Christ's redemption, showing that "in every dispensation of grace since the covenant was made with Abraham" their right to Church membership has been formally acknowledged. He holds, consequently, in opposition to the views of some of our writers—and, in our judgment, with better logic—that all children are entitled to baptism in their own right, apart from any consideration of parental piety, &c. Taken as a whole, the work is, as we have said, calculated to be eminently useful in general circulation. It has, however, some few faults. The writer is prolix, often to tediousness; his style is not always even perspic-

uous, and he abounds in repetitions. He needs to use greater care, and to spend more time upon his books, if he would have them last. The *limæ labor* is precisely the work to which he should turn himself.

(15.) THE history of German literature for the last three centuries is almost wholly a history of *Protestant* literature. Even the leading Catholic writers admit, that although the Roman Catholic part of Germany exceeds the Protestant, both in territory and in population, the vast majority of authors, in every department of science, are Protestants. Romanists complain, however, that the handbooks, in which the progress of literature is recorded, are all from Protestant hands, and have not, therefore, given impartial accounts: but the fact that those sources of knowledge are in Protestant hands is one of the very phenomena to be accounted for. To take away the reproach, and to secure justice to Roman writers, is one of the objects of the "*Geschichte der Katholischen Literatur in Deutschland*, (1854.) The author, Dr. Brühl, is a converted Jew. The promise of the work is greater than its performance: it is defective alike in point of style and of arrangement; nor is its matter as extensive, or as accurately worked out as could be wished. It is, nevertheless, the completest *apparatus* extant for the history of Catholic literature in Germany since the Reformation, in the branches to which the present volume is confined, namely, history and poetry. The author promises to follow it with a history of the other branches, and perhaps with a general survey of Roman Catholic literature.

(16.) THE American Baptist Publication Society has done well in reprinting Doddridge's "*Practical Discourses on Regeneration*." (Philadelphia: 18mo., pp. 337.) A memoir of the excellent author is prefixed.

(17.) WE have received the "*Annual of Scientific Discovery for 1855*." (Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1855; 12mo., pp. 394.) This valuable volume sets forth the most important discoveries and improvements in mechanics, chemistry, astronomy, and the physical sciences generally, and gives a list of recent publications and of patents; obituaries of eminent men; with notes on the progress of science, &c., during the past year. It is indispensable to every man of scientific or even of practical pursuits in active life.

(18.) "*A New and Extensive Analytical Examination of the Elements of Mental Science*, by the Rev. MOSES SMITH, A. M." (Cincinnati: printed for the author at the Methodist Book Concern, 1855; 12mo., pp. 491.) The design of the author, as stated in his preface, is "to present the philosophy of mind in as clear a light as possible—adapting the sentiments and arguments to the demands of the present age." The best part of the work, so far as we have examined it, is that which treats of volition. But one volume has reached us, though the preface promises two.

(19.) MR. LOUIS FASQUELLE, whose "New Method of Learning the French Language" has been heretofore commended in our pages, has issued, as a reading book, a very neat edition of "*Napoleon, par A. DUMAS.*" (New-York: Ivison & Phinney, 1855; 12mo., pp. 273.) The text gives a compendious, but graphic sketch of the career of Napoleon, in a thoroughly French vein. The book is furnished with conversational exercises, explanatory notes, &c., admirably adapting it for use in schools.

(20.) The title of "*The Young Man Advised*, by E. O. HAVEN, D. D.," (New-York: Carlton & Phillips; 12mo., pp. 329,) gives no adequate idea of the excellent book which it is meant to designate. The work exhibits the leading facts of the Bible and confirms them by other evidence, historical and philosophical, for the purpose of showing the divinity of the word of God. The topics treated are those which are commonly pressed into the service of infidelity by ignorant or unfair men. Such topics, for instance, as the Creation, the Deluge, the Confusion of tongues, the Races of men, &c. These points are discussed with sufficient learning for the purpose, and the style of the work is such as to commend it to universal acceptance.

(21.) MESSRS. CARTER & BROTHERS have republished the *unabridged* edition of "*The Saint's Everlasting Rest*, by RICHARD BAXTER." (New-York: 1855; 8vo., pp. 662.) This is the first time, we think, that this great work has been fully presented to the American public; and although the abridgments are, perhaps, better adapted for popular reading, the more extended treatise will be welcome to all ministers, as well as to many reading men and women among the laity.

(22.) "*The Physical Geography of the Sea*, by M. F. MAURY, LL. D.," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 8vo., pp. 274,) reveals a new world of observation to common readers. Our readers are aware that Mr. Maury is the great turnpike man of the ocean; and that, under his scientific guidance, "they that go down to the sea in ships" may now, for the most part, follow tracks as clearly defined as the lanes of a country neighbourhood. In this beautiful volume he unfolds, with a clearness peculiarly his own, the results of recent physical research into sea phenomena—winds, currents, salts, climate, inhabitants, &c.—and he has certainly succeeded in his aim of presenting "the gleanings from this new field in a manner that may be interesting and instructive to all, whether old or young, ashore or afloat, who desire a closer look into the wonders of the great deep."

(23.) "*The Teacher's Last Lesson*," (Boston: Gould & Lincoln; 1855; 12mo., pp. 284,) is a memoir of Miss Martha Whiting, late a teacher in the Female Seminary of Charlestown, Mass. It is made up, to a great extent, of extracts from Miss Whiting's journal, which, like almost all *diaries*, abounds in repetitions. But the book affords a good lesson of Christian devotion, and of zeal in the important work of school-teaching.

(24.) Of the "*Practical American Cook-book*" (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 1855; 12mo., pp. 267) we can only say, that to uninitiated readers, like ourselves, it looks well. We have read a recipe here and there that makes our mouths water. One thing is certain, that the science of cooking is yet in its beginnings in this country; and every book should be welcomed that tends to hasten the advent of a more civilized system in our kitchens, and thereby to diminish our national tendency to dyspepsia and liver complaint.

(25.) The fifth volume of "*The Lives of the Queens of Scotland*, by AGNES STRICKLAND," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855,) continues the life of Mary Stuart up to the time of her imprisonment in Lochleven Castle. When completed this will be the fullest and most minute biography of Mary; but it is, as we have said before, so thoroughly a partisan view of the case that it requires to be read with caution.

(26.) "*History for Boys*, by JOHN G. EDGAR." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 16mo., pp. 451.) This little book aims (and that successfully) to exhibit, in a manner attractive to juvenile readers, the most interesting and important events in the history of modern Europe. It is written, however, in a thoroughly English spirit.

(27.) "*The Family at Heatherdale*," (New-York: Carter & Brothers; 1855; 18mo., pp. 232,) is a story of Scottish life, designed to illustrate the influence of Christian principles upon the conduct of life. It has passed through three editions in Scotland, and deserves to run through as many here.

(28.) FLEETWOOD'S "*History of the Holy Bible*" has been reprinted in a handsome form by Messrs. R. Carter & Brothers. (New-York, 8vo., pp. 683.) The book, though without value for critical purposes, is well adapted for general circulation, and is especially attractive to children.

(29.) "*Christianity viewed in some of its Leading Aspects*, by the Rev. A. L. R. FOOTE." (Cincinnati: Swormstedt & Poe; 1855; 18mo., pp. 182.) This is a reprint of an excellent series of discourses, the English edition of which was briefly noticed in our pages some time ago. It treats of Christianity as a life, a work, a reward, a culture, a discipline and a fellowship; and each of these topics is worked out with much originality of thought and aptness of illustration. The style of the book is far beyond the ordinary standard of the religious literature of England, which, in this respect, is much inferior to that of America.

(30.) "*The Select Works of the Rev. Thomas Watson*." (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers; 1855; 8vo., pp. 776.) This edition of an old and excellent author contains a brief biography of Watson; his catechetical lectures, forming a body of practical divinity; and his select sermons and devotional treatises. Watson is always sensible, and often, in quaint wit, and terse expression, he approaches Fuller.

(31.) MESSRS. CARTER & BROTHERS have reprinted "*The Miscellaneous Works of MATTHEW HENRY*," (New-York: 1855; 2 vols., 8vo.) containing besides many of Henry's sermons, now first offered to American readers, forty discourses on "What Christ is made to believers," by Philip Henry, with the life of Philip. The rich evangelism of the Henrys makes even their scraps valuable.

(32.) "*Tricoloured Sketches in Paris*." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 12mo., pp. 368.) This volume contains the well-known letters from Paris, which appeared in the New-York Times in the years 1851-2-3. With many graphic sketches of life and manners, it contains, also, a veritable history of the times, set forth in pleasant and often sparkling language. The book is one of the best of its class; and the writer has evidently stuff in him for even better things.

(33.) "*Preces Paulinæ, or the Devotions of the Apostle Paul*," (New-York: Carter & Brothers; 1855; 18mo., pp. 338,) is a collection of the prayers of St. Paul, as recorded in the Acts and Epistles. The conception of the book is ingenious, and it is well carried out. We commend the book as an excellent devotional manual.

(34.) "*Memoirs of the Countess of Blessington*, by R. R. MADDEN." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 2 vols., 12mo.) Mr. Madden has not the slightest idea of what constitutes a true biography, and cannot even write good English; but yet the material for gossip—especially about literary men and women—that accumulated about the fair and frail Lady Blessington was so abundant that he could not help, by the aid of these accumulations, making a readable and interesting book. It is full of illustrations of the lamentable results that follow departures from virtue in man or woman.

(35.) "*The Speller and Definer's Manual*, by WILLIAM W. SMITH," (New-York: D. Burgess & Co.; 12mo., pp. 290,) is the most sensible book of its kind that has fallen under our notice. It contains a large collection of the most useful words in the language, arranged in classes, according to etymological analysis, with rules for prefixes, suffixes, &c., and all the apparatus for a practical text-book in schools. We are glad to see that the spelling is English and not Websterian; and we hope that Mr. Smith's book will supplant, generally, the spelling-books which are printed in that hybrid language.

(36.) "*Sanders' Young Ladies Reader*," (New-York: Ivison & Phinney; 1855; 12mo., pp. 500,) embraces "a course of instruction in the principles of rhetorical reading," with a number of choice selections from the best writers, for exercises. The other reading books of the same compiler have been very widely circulated, and this, we think, is equally deserving.

(37.) "*Inez: a Tale of the Alamo*" (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 12mo., pp. 298) is a very weak anti-Romanist novel.

(38.) M. HUC, the Jesuit missionary, whose "Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet" made so great a sensation a year or two ago, has appeared again in "*A Journey through the Chinese Empire*," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 1855; 2 vols., 12mo.,) which is, if possible, a work of greater attractiveness and importance than the other. Few men have had the opportunities of becoming acquainted with China that have fallen to his lot, and few could have used them to so good advantage. His descriptions have an air of truthfulness and reality about them which seems to be wanting in almost all other books of China; most travellers in the Flowery Land appear to see things in a mist, or, at all events, keep their readers in a fog; but M. Huc is as clear, transparent, and straight-forward as writers of his nation are wont to be. The only thing in the book that tests our power of belief at all, is the wonderful tact and skill that the missionary, according to his own account, displayed in getting out of all sorts of scrapes; but even in these cases he adapts his resources with great *vraisemblance* to the character of the Chinese as he describes them. The book will afford matter for a more extended article hereafter, if we can find room for it; in the meantime we commend it to our readers as the best account of Chinese life that has fallen under our notice. They will know how to make allowance for the writer's Romanism, and to judge of his religious observations accordingly.

(39.) "*Lectures on the Doctrine of Election*," by ALEXANDER C. RUTHERFORD." (Philadelphia: Higgins & Perkinpine; 12mo., pp. 288.) This is the work of a former minister in the United Secession Church, of Scotland, who has abandoned Calvinism. It treats, first, of the ultra-Calvinistic theory of election; and secondly, of the "moderate" theory, showing how widely both differ from the Scriptural theory, which is the third exhibited. Without coinciding with the author in all points, or approving, invariably, of the terms in which he has expressed himself with regard to his opponents, we can recommend his book as a valuable controversial treatise, setting forth the subject in a mode adapted to general readers as well as to professional ones.

(40.) "*The Minister's Family*," by the Rev. W. M. HETHERINGTON," (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers; 1855; 12mo.,) is a very pious story, but, we are sorry to say, a very dull one.

(41.) "*An Introduction to Practical Astronomy*," by ELIAS LOOMIS, LL. D.," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 8vo., pp. 497,) is the first and only book of its class published in America. It aims to give an adequate description of the instruments required in the outfit of an observatory, and also to explain the methods of employing them. Besides the chapters that treat of these topics, there are others on the Diurnal Motion, or Time, Latitude, the Ecliptic, Parallax, Eclipses, and the Longitude. Under these various heads an ample supply of problems is discussed. The book concludes with a large book of tables, many of which are new. To all teachers of astronomy, to all students of the higher class, and to amateurs who wish to pursue the subject thoroughly, this work will be indispensable.

(42.) Mr. ABBOTT has ended his series of Franconia Stories with "*Agnes*, by the author of the Rollo books." (New-York: Harper & Brothers, pp. 221.) The ten volumes furnish a beautiful and morally unexceptionable collection of reading for children. We know no drawback upon these and Mr. Abbott's other excellent books for the young, except the occasional provincialisms and inaccuracies of expression which disfigure them. Books for children should be even more carefully written than those for adults.

(43.) "*Foster's First Principles of Chemistry*," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 12mo., pp. 136,) is a strictly elementary book, designed for the use of schools and academies. The method is excellent, the style clear, and the illustrations abundant. With a box of apparatus, costing twenty-five dollars, and this little treatise, a careful teacher can give the pupils a better knowledge of the elements of chemistry than is carried away from college by most graduates.

(44.) "*The Story of the Peasant-Boy Philosopher*," by HENRY MAYHEW," (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 16mo., pp. 477,) is a very entertaining and instructive book, founded on the early life of Ferguson, the astronomer. It is not a biography, but an illustration of the modes in which the boy's mind received its bent, and in which other boys may learn, and love to learn, the laws of nature. It is full of interest, and will be found as attractive to children as a fairy-tale.

(45.) "*Bradbury's Young Shawn*," (New-York: Mason Brothers,) is the very absurd name of a collection of school-music, which appears to be well adapted for the instruction of beginners.

(46.) The "*Prose Writers of Germany*," by F. H. HEDGE." (New-York: C. S. Francis & Co.; 1855; 8vo., pp. 56.) This excellent compilation has passed to a third edition. The title does not convey a just notion of the contents of the book, which contains, in fact, a selection from the very best authors in the whole range of German literature, from Luther to Schleiermacher. Instead of giving a multitude of brief extracts, the editor has wisely chosen to give fewer writers, but larger and more satisfactory specimens of the style of each; and he has executed this delicate task with great judgment and skill. Readers, unacquainted with German, may obtain from this volume a very tolerable notion of the peculiar character and value of the vast literature of that language.

(47.) "*A Guide-Book in the Administration of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*," by OSMON C. BAKER, D. D." (New-York: Carlton & Phillips; 12mo., pp. 249.) This will hereafter be an essential *vade-mecum* for Methodist preachers. The only work attempting any of the ends aimed at in this treatise by Bishop Baker, is Bishop Hedding's "*Discourse on the Administration of the Discipline*," which, though admirable in its way, does not go into details to any great extent. The present work "descends to the very minutia

of the pastor's daily duties." It is divided into ten chapters, of which the first treats of Church Membership; the second, of the Conferences; the third, of Ministers; the fourth, of Certificates and Lovefeasts; the fifth, of Church trials; the sixth, of Church Property; the seventh, of Ministerial support; and the eighth, of Rules of Order. The ninth chapter gives a collection of forms, such as reports, licenses, &c.; and the tenth sets forth the prescribed courses of study for both travelling and local preachers. This *conspectus* will suffice to show the scope of the work. Its chief characteristic is good sense, the essential quality for such discussion. Though the views of the book are not offered as authoritative, we think there are very few of them that will be dissented from. The style is generally clear and perspicuous; but there are several inaccuracies of expression, which we hope will be corrected in future editions.

(48.) "*Leaves from a Family Journal, from the French of EMILE SOUVETRE,*" (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 12mo., pp. 277,) is a picture of domestic life in France. A young couple commence housekeeping, and find the usual difficulties incident to bringing up a family. The story is given with great delicacy and refinement, and many of the scenes are exquisitely painted.

(49.) "*Life in Earnest; or, Memoirs of the Rev. ZENAS CALDWELL, by STEPHEN M. VAIL, A. M.*" (Boston: J. P. Magee; 12mo., pp. 188.) This is a sketch of the life and character of a very worthy young minister, who died in 1826, almost in the beginning of his career. He belonged to a family remarkable for sterling qualities, both mental and moral; and this memoir shows that he was a worthy scion of an excellent stock. Mr. Caldwell was the friend and associate of President Pierce in his student days, and the book is dedicated to him. It deserves wide circulation among the young men of the Church.

(50.) "*Sermons of the Rev. I. S. SPENCER, D. D.*" (New-York: M. W. Dodd; 2 vols., 12mo.) Dr. Spencer was pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, and was thoroughly faithful and successful in his work. As a preacher, he was distinguished for simplicity, directness and force; and these qualities are all displayed in these two volumes of sermons. A memoir of Dr. Spencer, by the Rev. J. M. Sherwood, is prefixed.

(51.) "*The Ethics of Funerals,* by the Rev. J. B. WAKELEY," (New-York: 200 Mulberry-street; pp. 34,) is a vindication of the author and of the Methodist Episcopal Church "against the slanders of the New-York Churchman, with regard to the funeral of William Poole." What those slanders were is stated by Mr. Wakeley, as follows:—

"They are, in substance, that I gave a 'Marc Antony exhibition over the coffin of Bill Poole, and in his honour;' that I made 'a monstrous connexion between Christianity and a profane bully, a brutal pugilist,' so monstrous that no 'Christian man in his senses could seriously entertain it;' that I, 'a so-called clergyman, worked out the happy thought for Bill Poole's associates, that how-

ever wicked their lives might be, all could be right at last;’ that my remarks at the funeral amounted to ‘*profanity and blasphemy*;’ that the Methodist Episcopal Church is ‘a fanatical sect,’ a ‘religious community, calling itself Christian,’ whose doctrines, pushed far enough, amount to this, that ‘however vile’ a man’s life may have been, ‘any relenting at the hour of death *may* be taken as an expression of that faith which is to save the soul everlastingly.’”

Mr. Wakeley’s vindication is ample and complete. His pamphlet is exceedingly severe; but justly so.

(52.) “*The whole French Language*, by T. ROBERTSON,” (New-York: Roe Lockwood & Son; 12mo., pp. 605;) with a Key, (12mo., pp. 107.) This book contains a series of French lessons, admirably adapted for class-teaching or for private use. The plan is novel; the text—a continuous and interesting story—is divided into short passages, which are to be translated and re-translated, analyzed and re-combined, until the words and the syntax become thoroughly familiar. We can give no adequate notion of the merits of the work in a brief notice; but we earnestly advise all teachers and students of French to examine it for themselves.

(53.) “*My Mother; or, Recollections of Maternal Influence*,” (Boston: Gould & Lincoln; 12mo., pp. 254,) is not a biography, but a series of illustrations of the forming influence of a good mother’s care, strung upon the thread of a loose narrative. It is an admirable book; its spirit, aim, and execution are alike excellent.

(54.) “*The May-Flower and Miscellaneous Writings*, by HARRIET BEECHER STOWE.” (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co.; 12mo., pp. 471.) This volume contains a number of sketches, stories, &c., which have before been published in various forms. If any one doubts Mrs. Stowe’s genius, let him read “Love and Law” in this volume; if he continues to doubt, we give him up. If she had never written “Uncle Tom,” this volume contains proof enough of her dramatic and graphic faculty to put her into the first rank of American authors. There are a few provincialisms of expression—such as “tedious” for “annoying,” “as” for “that,” &c., which we are sorry to see.

(55.) “*Class-Meetings*, by the REV. L. ROSSER, A. M.” (Richmond; 1855; 12mo., pp. 365.) This work is divided into five parts: of which the first treats of the origin and nature of class-meetings; the second, of their obligation; the third, of their benefits; the fourth, of objections and excuses; the fifth, of the duties they devolve upon preachers, leaders, and people; and the sixth, of their temporal advantages. The book is more comprehensive and complete than any of the others published of late years upon the topic; but, like the author’s other writings that have fallen under our notice, it is often loose and prolix in style.

(56.) “*The Golden Reed, or the True Measure of a True Church*, by B. F. BARRETT,” (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 1855; 12mo., pp. 311,) is an

attempt to show that the religious society founded by Baron Swedenborg is a universal and truly catholic Church. The book is very well written, except the extracts from Swedenborg.

(57.) "*The History of Turkey*, by A. DE LAMARTINE." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co., vol. 1, 12mo.) Lamartine always writes the poetry of history; but not, on that account, any the less its truth. We regard him, as, in the main, one of the most truthful writers of the age. The present subject is admirably suited to his genius; he bathes you in the very atmosphere of orientalism; his paragraphs are paintings. Much of this first volume is, so to speak, legendary; the two volumes that follow will test the author's skill more fully than any task he has yet undertaken.

(58.) "*The History of Switzerland*, by H. ZSCHOKKE, translated by F. G. SHAW." (New-York: C. S. Francis & Co.; 12mo., pp. 405.) This work is the common text-book of the Swiss, in all the cantons, and it was a happy inspiration that led Mr. Shaw to translate it. It begins with the earliest periods, and carries the history down to 1848. Breathing the spirit of true liberty it should be welcome, doubly, to American youth.

(59.) "*A Commonplace Book of Thoughts, Memories, and Fancies*, by MRS. JAMIESON." (New-York: D. Appleton & Co.; 1855; 12mo., pp. 329.) Mrs. Jamieson has been in the habit for many years of jotting down any *thought* that might occur to her, or any passage in a book that might strongly arrest her attention. This book is made up of such jottings. It is divided into two parts: I. Ethics and Character; II. Literature and Art. Under the former head there is a genial sketch of Father Taylor, of Boston.

(60.) "*Travels in Europe and the East*, by SAMUEL IRENEUS PRIME." (New-York: Harper & Brothers; 2 vols., 12mo.) Mr. Prime spent a year in travelling Great Britain, France, Germany, and the East; and, while abroad, kept up a correspondence with the New-York Observer, which was very widely read. The letters are gathered, with many additions, into these two handsome volumes, which contain a vast fund of entertaining and instructive reading.

(61.) "*Visits to European Celebrities*, by WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D." (Boston: Gould & Lincoln; 1855; 12mo., pp. 305,) is a gossiping, pleasant, and instructive account of the personal appearance and peculiarities of many of the most distinguished men and women of the nineteenth century. Dr. Sprague visited Europe in 1828, and again in 1836, and, on both occasions, he made it a study to get some personal knowledge, if possible, of all sorts of eminent people. Notes and memoranda, taken at the time, have been wisely suffered to lie quiet until most of the persons described have passed away; and they are now, as wisely, collected into this entertaining volume.

(62.) "*Experimental Religion*, by the REV. L. ROSSER." (Richmond, 1855, 12mo., pp. 181.) That this work should have already passed through five editions is no small testimony to its adaptation to the wants of the religious public. It treats of justification, regeneration, sanctification, and the witness of the Spirit, in clear and simple language, avoiding all technical discussion. The book is specially suited to young converts.

(63.) "*The Christian Retrospect and Register*, by ROBERT BAIRD." (New-York: M. W. Dodd; 1855; 12mo., pp. 442.) We spoke very favourably of this book on its first appearance some years ago; and have now only to add that this new edition contains a supplementary chapter bringing the statistics of Christianity down to as late a period as possible. If the part relating to politics, science, &c., were omitted, and the space thus obtained devoted to religious facts and notices, the work would have more unity and more completeness.

(64.) "*The Dead in Christ*, by JOHN BROWN, D. D.," (New-York: Carter & Brothers; 1855; 18mo., pp. 165.) is addressed chiefly to bereaved Christians, and presents them many points of comfort and consolation derived from the knowledge afforded us in Scripture with regard to the condition of the dead. Dr. Brown goes at some length into the proof of a separate state of conscious being between death and the resurrection. The work is inspired by Christian faith, and glows with a truly Christian hope.

(65.) "*A Model for Men of Business*, by the REV. HUGH STOWELL," (New-York: Carlton & Phillips; 1855; 18mo., pp. 322,) is an excellent manual on the subject indicated by the title. It was originally published by the author as a course of lectures; but is here put into a more practical and readable shape. Prefixed to the work is a judicious introduction by Dr. Curry.

* * * Several book notices are unavoidably omitted for want of room.

ART. X.—RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

JOHN KITTO, D. D., so well known as a laborious writer in Biblical literature, died at Cannstatt, near Stuttgart, on the 25th of November, 1854. John Kitto was born at Plymouth, on the 4th December, 1804. His family was of Cornish origin; and in his "*Lost Senses—Deafness*," he speculates on the probability of his descent from a Phœnician ancestry. His father, who began life as a master builder, had, like Falstaff, a kind of "alacrity in sinking;" he became reduced to the position of a jobbing mason, in which business young Kitto's help was required at a very

early age. While the boy was thus occupied, in February, 1817, a fall from the top of a house totally destroyed his sense of hearing. His previous education had been meagre; but the love of reading, which he had already acquired, became the solace of his loneliness and the foundation of his attainments. In 1819, his parents being unable to maintain or to find suitable employment for him, placed him in the workhouse, whence he was removed, in 1821, to become apprenticed to a shoemaker. His master was a coarse tyrant. The poor boy appealed to the

magistrates. His written statement was marked by a striking propriety of sentiment and diction. The indentures were cancelled, and he returned to the work-house—to him a welcome refuge. He was not idle there. In 1823, his talents and capabilities being better understood, he was enabled, by the kindness of two gentlemen of the neighbourhood, to publish a small volume of essays and letters, and was placed in a position less unfavourable to self-improvement. The next ten years of Dr. Kitto's life appear to have been spent in travelling or residing abroad. He journeyed over a large part of Europe and Asia, and acquired that familiarity with the scenery and customs of the East which was afterward of such signal service in the department of literature to which he became devoted. Returning to England in 1833, he gained attention by a series of papers in the "Penny Magazine," under the title of "The Deaf Traveller," and having married, commenced a course of literary activity which was continued without interruption till within a few months of his decease. His exertions seem to have been prompted, from an early age, by a strong sense of duty; the duty of self-improvement, and of doing some service to the world. More palpable motives to laborious diligence were presented in the claims of an aged mother and a rapidly-increasing family. But his physical infirmity placed him at a disadvantage; and for several years before his death he was exposed to pecuniary difficulties, which his pension of one hundred pounds a year did not wholly remove. It is feared that he fell a victim to hard work and overpowering anxiety. A neuralgic affection of two years' standing was followed, last spring, by a paralytic or quasi paralytic attack. Through the kindly help of friends, the sufferer was removed in August, with his family, to the continent; but the deaths, in rapid succession, of his youngest and his eldest child, neutralized the benefit which might otherwise have been looked for from the change, and a third fit extinguished the feeble remains of life. Dr. Kitto's writings are well known. With a few exceptions, (relating chiefly to his own disability, and to his reminiscences of travel,) they aim, directly or indirectly, at the illustration of the sacred Scriptures. This was his chosen department of labour, and in it he attained a high degree of eminence. We subjoin a list of his publications:—"Bible History of the Holy Land," 8vo.; "Court and People of Per-

sia," 18mo.; "Cyclopædia of British Literature," 2 vols. roy. 8vo.; also, an "Abridged" and a "People's" edition of this Cyclopædia; "Daily Bible Illustrations," 8 vols. 12mo.; "Essays and Letters," with a Memoir, 12mo.; "Geography of the Holy Land," with Atlas, roy. 8vo.; "History of Palestine," 12mo.; "Pictorial" ditto, 2 vols. roy. 8vo.; "Lost Senses, Deafness and Blindness," 2 vols. 18mo.; "Physical Geography of the Holy Land," 2 vols. 18mo.; "Pictorial Life of our Saviour," 4to.; "Scripture Lands and Bible Atlas," 12mo.; "The Tabernacle and its Furniture," 4to. He also established and conducted, until within two years, "The Journal of Sacred Literature," which has since passed into the hands of Rev. G. Burgess.

A new edition of "*The Works of Robert Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln*," (Oxford; 1854; bds. 8vo.), has appeared, from the Clarendon press, carefully edited by Professor Jacobson. Its most important parts are the semi-scholastic treatises "*De Obligatione Conscientie*," and "*De Juramenti Obligatione*;" but it contains besides several treatises, sermons, &c., now printed for the first time.

"*Le Bouddhisme, son fondateur et ses écritures*," par FELIX NEVE," Professor at Louvain, (Paris: 1854,) is said to contain a good résumé of the facts and the literature of Buddhism.

An edition of Calvin's "*Treatise on Relics*," newly translated from the French original, with an Introductory Dissertation on the Miraculous Images, as well as other Superstitions, of the Roman Catholic and Russo-Greek Churches, has recently appeared in Edinburgh. The *Witness* speaks of it as "a complete philosophical and historical treatise on the saint and image worship of the Roman and Russian Churches. It abounds with curious and interesting information, and, what is more, it is interspersed with judicious reflections, exposing the follies which it records, and furnishing brief satisfactory replies to the specious arguments by which these follies have been supported. The most interesting portion of this volume, at the present time, is the chapter in which our author treats of the Greco-Russian Church."

"*An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament; with Remarks on its Revision upon Critical Principles; together with a Collation of the Critical Texts of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tisch-*

dorff, with that in *Common Use*. By S. PRIDEAUX TREGELLES, LL.D." (London: Bagsters, 1854; 8vo., pp. 390.) This is certainly one of the most important and valuable works for the criticism of the text of the New Testament that has yet appeared in Great Britain. It contains a mass of valuable information, for which the student would otherwise have to search through many scarce and costly volumes. A mere statement of its contents will suffice to this. It gives a full account (pp. 1-174) of all the editions of the Greek text, from the Complutensian down to the latest labours of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. Then follow (pp. 174-226) remarks upon the principles of textual criticism, in which a full and satisfactory theory is clearly set forth and ably maintained. The remainder of the main body of the work is taken up with notes on various passages of dogmatic importance, (pp. 226-274.) After all this comes a separate and elaborate collation of the critical texts of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf with that in common use, arranged in parallel columns: so that the student is actually better off with this volume in his hand, than with the text of these editors before him. We recommend this most valuable work to the careful attention of all faithful Biblical students.

"*Geschichte der Americanischen Urreligion*," (History of the Primitive Religion of America,) by J. G. MÜLLER, Professor of Theology at the University of Basel. (Basel; 1855; pp. 706.) This is a work of great learning and research, and therefore a most valuable contribution to the ecclesiastical history of the world in general and of America in particular. The author, who is distinguished for his attainments in classic as well as in Church history, has carefully examined all the sources of information on his subject, and communicates to us, on almost every page, the discoveries of modern science in the primitive history of religious systems. The *Introduction* undertakes to show: 1. That the Indians did not receive their forms of worship from the ancient nations of the old world; 2. That their religious opinions may, therefore, be said to be aboriginal; and 3. That the disagreement of the Indians in these opinions is best explained by the difference of their relations to nature. The two chief divisions of the book are: I. The religion of the savage tribes, (red men; the inhabitants of the great Antilles; the Caribs, the east of South America.) II. The religion

of the civilized tribes, (the Peruvians, Muyscas, and Mexicans.) We shall endeavour to recur to this work hereafter, and to point out some serious errors into which the learned author has fallen.

In France, as in all Catholic countries, the civil law forbids any Catholic who has received a clerical order, and afterward wishes to leave the ranks of the priesthood, to get lawfully married. All attempts to abrogate this law have been frustrated by the exertions of the bishops. The treatise of Bishop Pavy, of Algiers, "*Du Célibat Ecclésiastique*," (on Ecclesiastical Celibacy,) is a specimen of the kind of pleading by which Catholic prelates maintain their opinions on religious liberty. A deacon in the Roman Catholic Church of Algiers felt no vocation to pursue his ecclesiastical studies, entered on another career, and resolved to get married. The ecclesiastical authority opposes; the civil courts of Bona, however, support the right of the claimant; then the Bishop of Algiers himself addresses a letter to General Hautpoul, the Governor of Algiers. The governor intervenes with the ministers of war, of justice, and of worship; and, finally, the poor deacon is declared deprived of the right of marrying, and the Catholic party and the Catholic press exclaim rejoicingly. The support of the civil law has always been given to the ecclesiastical law of celibacy; and, it may be said, that on this point the legislation of France is settled.

FATHER DE RAVIGNAN is the most celebrated among the French Jesuits of the present age, and stands first perhaps among the Catholic pulpit celebrities of France. He is also known to the public as one of the most influential writers of the order; and he has come forward several times for its defence. In his work "*Clement XIII. et Clement XIV.*, par le pere DE RAVIGNAN:" (Paris; 1854; 2 vols., pp. 574 and 502) he represents the Jesuitic side in the hot discussion which has been going on for some years with regard to Pope Clement XIV., who suppressed the Jesuits. Not long ago a priest of high standing in Rome, although by birth a German, Augustin Theiner, Priest of the Oratorium, Prefect-coadjutor of the Archives of the Vatican, Consulor of the Congregation of the Index and other congregations, a member of the special Congregation on the Immaculate Conception, etc., etc., published a "*History of the Pontificate of Clement XIV.*," from unprinted documents of the secret

archives of the Vatican, (Paris: Didot; 3 vols.,) in which he tried to exalt Clement XII. as one of the greatest popes; and, in order to achieve this, came out very severely against the Jesuits of that time. Of course, a book like this created indescribable confusion in the Catholic world, which is now more than ever under the influence of the Jesuits. The French historian of the order, Cretineau-Joly, undertook the defence of the Jesuits; but, alas! his book was put on the Index. The general of the Jesuits, P. Roothan, fearing that the controversy might turn out badly for the order, declined all responsibility for Cretineau-Joly's work, but wrote at the same time to P. de Ravignan, to intervene with his name and talent for his brethren. Such is the origin of this book. It tries to justify both the Jesuits and the pope who suppressed them. In its zeal for the honour of the pope, the author denies even such indisputable facts as the agreement by which Ganganelli, before the election, bound himself to Spain, to suppress the order. Nevertheless, the work has valuable material for the history of the order, as the great part of the second volume consists of documents heretofore unknown.

Among the new works announced on the continent of Europe are the following:—

Symbolik der christlichen Confessionen und Religionspartheien von Prof. Dr. A. H. Baier. 1. Bd.: Symbolik der römisch-kathol. Kirche. 2. Abthl: Der röm. Katholicismus in der Organisation seiner besonderen Sphären. gr. 8. (iv pp. und pp. 253–619. Greifswald.

Vorlesungen ueber praktische Theologie von Dr. J. H. Aug. Ebrard. gr. 8. (xiv and 378 pp.) Königsberg.

Das Wesen der Kirche beleuchtet nach Lehre u. Geschichte d. Neuen Testaments mit vornehm. Rücksicht auf die Streitfrage zwischen Protestantismus u. Katholicismus v. Semin. Repetent Jul. Koestlin. gr. 8. (vii and 128 pp.) Stuttgart.

Geschichte des alten Bundes v. Prof. Dr. Joh. Heinr. Kurtz. (2. Bd. in 2 Abthl.) gr. 8. (1. Abthl. pp. 1–320.) Berlin, 1855.

Novum testamentum triglottum graece latine germanice; graecum textum addito lectionum variarum delectu recensuit, lat-

inum Hieronymi notata Clementina lectione ex autoritate codd. restituit, germanicum ad pristinae Lutheranae editionis veritatem revocavit Aenoth. Jud. Const. Tischendorf. 8vo. (xlii and 930 pp.) Lipsiae.

Das alte Testament im neuen Testament von Dr. A. Tholuck. Ueber die Citate d. Alten Testaments im Neuen Testament u. ü. d. Opfer- u. Priesterbegriff im alten u. neuen Testament. [Zwei Beilagen zu d. Kommentare ü. d. Brief an die Hebräer.] 4. verm. Aufl. gr. 8. (iv and 116 pp.) Gotha.

Auberlen, Dr. C. A., Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältniss betrachtet und in ihren Hauptstellen erläutert. 8. Basel. 449 pp.

Among the new books recently announced in Great Britain are the following:—

Scriptural Predestination, with Remarks upon the Baptismal Question. By the Rev. Robert Knight. 1 vol. 8vo.:—Jashar. Fragmenta Archetypa, Carminum Hebraicorum in Masorethico Veteris Testamenti Textu passim tessellata collegit, restituit ordinavit, in unum corpus redegit, Latine exhibuit, commentario instruxit Joannes Gulielmus Donaldson, S. Theologiae Doctor, Collegii SS. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses quondam Socinus. 8vo.:—Three new volumes of Owen's Works; being the Second Issue of the Exposition to the Hebrews, and embracing volumes ii, iii, and iv of the Work:—Christ as made known to the Ancient Church: An Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace, as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By the late Robert Gordon, D. D., F. R. S. E.: 4 vols., demy 8vo.:—The Christian Cyclopaedia; or, Repertory of Biblical and Theological Literature. By the Rev. James Gardner, M. D. and A. M. Imp. 8vo.:—The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof. By the Rev. W. Lee, J. C. D. 8vo.:—Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy. By the Rev. W. Archer Butler, late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin. Edited, from the Author's Manuscripts, by W. H. Thompson, M. A. 2 vols., 8vo.:—A Second Series of Sermons. Edited from the Manuscripts of the Rev. W. Archer Butler, by the Rev. J. A. Jeremie, D. D. 8vo.